

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 88-74  
H. R. 40

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 40 . . . . .	.1
Digest of Public Law 88-74 . . . . .	.2



## INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 40

- Jan. 9, 1963 Rep. Abernethy introduced H. R. 40, which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
- Mar. 6, 1963 House Subcommittee on research and Extension voted to report H. R. 40.
- Mar. 14, 1963 Sen. Eastland introduced S. 1070, which was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
- May 1, 1963 House Agriculture Committee voted to report H. R. 40.
- May 2, 1963 House Agriculture Committee reported H. R. 40. H. Report 271. Print of bill and report.
- May 6, 1963 House passed H. R. 40, under suspension of the rules.
- May 8, 1963 H. R. 40 was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as referred.
- June 19, 1963 Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report H. R. 40.
- June 20, 1963 Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported H. R. 40. S. Report 288. Print of bill and report.
- June 25, 1963 Senate passed over H. R. 40.
- July 10, 1963 Senate passed H. R. 40.
- July 22, 1963 Approved: Public Law 88-74.









88TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 40

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 9, 1963

Mr. ABERNETHY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to  
4       continue its support of agricultural research at the State  
5       agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds,  
6       on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as  
7       required for the effective conduct of an adequate research  
8       program.

9       SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to assist the State  
10      agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisi-  
11      tion, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other

1 capital facilities (including the acquisition of fixtures and  
2 equipment which are to become a part of such buildings)  
3 which are necessary to more effectively conduct research in  
4 agriculture and sciences related thereto through means of  
5 grants from the Federal Government.

6 SEC. 3. As used in sections 2 to 11, inclusive, of this  
7 Act—

8 (1) the term “State” shall include Puerto Rico;

9 (2) the term “State agricultural experiment sta-  
10 tion” means a department established under the direc-  
11 tion of a college or university in any State in accord-  
12 ance with the Act entitled “An Act donating public  
13 lands to the several States and Territories which may  
14 provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and me-  
15 chanic arts”, approved July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301);  
16 or a department otherwise established pursuant to  
17 standards prescribed by the State the purpose of which  
18 is to conduct agricultural research; and

19 (3) the term “Secretary” shall mean the Secre-  
20 tary of Agriculture.

21 SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appro-  
22 priated for allocation to the States for the purposes of sec-  
23 tion 2 such sums as the Congress deems advisable.

1       (b) (1) One-third of the funds appropriated pursuant  
2 to this section for any fiscal year shall be allotted equally  
3 among the States.

4       (2) Two-thirds of the funds appropriated pursuant to  
5 this section for any fiscal year shall be allocated among the  
6 States as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the  
7 same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural  
8 population of the State bears to the total rural population of  
9 all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial  
10 census current at the time each such sum is first appropri-  
11 ated; and one-half in an amount which bears the same ratio  
12 to the total amount to be allotted as the farm population of  
13 the State bears to the total farm population of all the States  
14 as determined by the last preceding decennial census current  
15 at the time such sum is first appropriated.

16       (c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secre-  
17 tary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this Act  
18 under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as neces-  
19 sary therefor.

20       SEC. 5. Any State in order to be eligible for payments  
21 from funds allocated pursuant to section 4 shall submit, in  
22 such form as the Secretary may require, specific proposals  
23 for acquisition or construction of physical facilities defined in

1 section 2 of this Act. No State shall receive any payment  
2 for any such proposal unless such proposal is approved by  
3 the Secretary.

4 SEC. 6. (a) No payment shall be made to any State  
5 under the provisions of section 4 of this Act in any amount  
6 greater than the amount made available by such State  
7 from non-Federal funds for purposes for which payments  
8 are made under section 4 of this Act.

9 (b) Any unused portion of the allotment of any State  
10 for any fiscal year shall remain available, at the option of  
11 such State, for payment to such State for a period of not  
12 more than two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which  
13 such allotment is first made available.

14 SEC. 7. With respect to multiple-purpose physical facili-  
15 ties, the segment or portion thereof which is to be utilized for  
16 agricultural research shall be the basis for determination of  
17 fund support under this Act.

18 SEC. 8. For each fiscal year that funds are made avail-  
19 able for allocation to States under the provisions of section 4  
20 and section 6 of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain, at  
21 the earliest practicable date during such year, the amount  
22 of the allocation to which each State is entitled, and shall  
23 notify each State in writing promptly thereafter as to the  
24 amount of such allocation.

25 SEC. 9. (a) Any State agricultural experiment station



1 authorized to receive payments under the provisions of  
2 section 4 of this Act shall have a chief administrative officer,  
3 to be known as a director, and a treasurer or other officer  
4 appointed by the governing board of such station. Such  
5 treasurer or other officer shall receive and account for all  
6 funds paid to such station pursuant to the provisions of this  
7 Act, and shall submit a report, approved by the director of  
8 such station, to the Secretary on or before the first day of  
9 September of each year. Such report shall contain a de-  
10 tailed statement of the amount received under the provisions  
11 of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its dis-  
12 bursements on schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

13 (b) If any portion of the allotted funds received by the  
14 authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experi-  
15 ment station shall by any action or contingency be dimin-  
16 ished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be repaid by the State  
17 concerned, and until repaid no part of any subsequent appro-  
18 priation shall be allocated or paid to such State.

19 SEC. 10. The Secretary shall make an annual report to  
20 the Congress during the first regular session of each year  
21 with respect to (1) payments made under this Act, (2)  
22 the facilities, by States, for which such payments were made,  
23 and (3) whether any portion of the appropriation available  
24 for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the  
25 reasons therefor.

1        SEC. 11. (a) Any agricultural experiment station estab-  
2        lished by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this  
3        Act.

4        (b) With respect to any State in which more than one  
5        agricultural experiment station has been established, any  
6        appropriations allocated for the use of such State pursuant  
7        to the provisions of this Act shall be divided between or  
8        among such institutions as the legislature of such State shall  
9        direct.

10       SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated  
11       such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of  
12       this Act.



---

# A BILL

---

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

---

By Mr. ABERNETHY

---

JANUARY 9, 1963

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued March 7, 1963  
For actions of March 6, 1963  
88th-1st, No. 34

## CONTENTS

Air pollution.....10	Economics.....15,28	Forestry.....22
Appropriations....21,27,32	Electrification.....19	Health benefits.....33
Area redevelopment.....5	Employment.....25	Information.....12
Budget.....6	Executive leadership....14	Intergovernmental relations.....39
Buildings.....17	Expenditures.....11	Military service.....9
CCC.....27	Experiment stations.....1	Personnel.....13,25,33
Census.....37	Farm labor.....35	Plant quarantine.....3
Committee assignments...21	Federal Register.....20	Public Law 480.....27
Committee funds.....8	Foreign aid.....4	Reclamation.....23
Cotton.....30,36	Foreign trade.....7	Records.....18
		Recreation.....29
		Research.....1,34
		Supplemental appropriations.....27
		Taxation.....26,31
		Transportation.....16,38
		Water pollution.....40
		Water supply.....24
		Weather.....34
		Wildlife.....22
		Youth employment.....2

HIGHLIGHTS: House subcommittees voted to report: Youth Conservation Corps bill, bill to provide additional research facilities for experiment stations. Rep. Whitten requested cancellation of USDA proposal for entry of foreign plant growing media. Rep. Alger criticized Area Redevelopment program and proposed Youth Employment programs. Rep. Byrne urged enactment of legislation for Youth employment programs. Rep. Snyder inserted Farm Bureau editorial urging reduction in USDA budget. Rep. Dorn introduced and discussed cotton bills.

## HOUSE

1. RESEARCH. The Subcommittee on Research and Extension of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 40, to provide a program of Federal aid to the States to provide additional facilities for research at State agriculture experiment stations. p. D111
2. YOUTH EMPLOYMENT. The General Subcommittee on Education of the Education and Labor Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 1890, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps and to authorize local area youth employment programs (p. D112). Rep. Alger criticized this bill and contended that "Actually a shortage rather than excess of skilled labor exists" (pp. 3372-3). Rep. Byrne commended the bill and stated that it "will serve admirably the need to provide the special training opportunities that presently out-of-work young people must receive to fit them for beginning jobs" (pp. 3387-8)

3. PLANT QUARANTINE. Rep. Whitten criticized a proposal by this Department to amend the "nursery stock, plant, and seeds quarantine No. 37," which would "permit growing media in which plants were grown in foreign countries to be brought into this country," and stated he had requested the Secretary to cancel this proposed amendment. p. 3348
4. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Hall criticized U. N. aid to Cuba, including aid for agricultural development, and contended that such aid was being subsidized by American taxpayers. pp. 3357-8
5. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Alger criticized the area redevelopment program and the activities of the Extension Service in the program, stating that "As part of the area redevelopment program the Extension Service has been asked to combine its traditional service to individuals with group decisions and social action." pp. 3370-1
6. BUDGET. Rep. Snyder inserted an editorial from the Ky. Farm Bureau journal urging a reduction in the President's Budget, including that for this Department, and stating that the "Farm Bureau is recommending a reduction of \$1 billion in the current level of expenditures for the Department of Agriculture and we believe it can be done if Farm Bureau's farm program is adopted." p. 3399
7. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Rogers (Fla.) criticized the use of ships from friendly nations to carry cargo to Cuba and urged that all U. S. ports be closed to flagships calling in Cuba. p. 3340
8. COMMITTEE FUNDS. Agreed to resolutions authorizing funds to finance activities of Banking and Currency Committee and the Education and Labor Committee. pp. 3340-7, 3363-70
9. MILITARY SERVICE. The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2438, to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (H. Rept. 59). p. 3401
10. AIR POLLUTION. Rep. Roberts (Ala.) urged the enactment of his bill for a comprehensive national effort to control air pollution (H. R. 4415). pp. 3348-50
11. EXPENDITURES. Rep. Joelson inquired into the purposes for which Federal expenditures are made and explained his feeling that Congress should "not deny or begrudge our own Government the just cost of our sizable and complicated operations." pp. 3355-6
12. INFORMATION. Rep. MacGregor criticized the handling of news and information in the Administration and called for "credibility in the government." pp. 3359-61
13. PERSONNEL. Rep. Libonati inserted an announcement by former President Eisenhower to Federal civilian employees on the institution of Group Life Insurance for Federal employees. pp. 3362-3
14. EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP. Several representatives debated the effectiveness of the President's legislative leadership. pp. 3373-78
15. ECONOMICS. Rep. Keith inserted a speech by the President of Bates College criticizing the shrinking of the profit drive of our competitive economy, and favoring more competition in the field of agriculture. pp. 3396-99.







88TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# S. 1070

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 14, 1963

Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

---

## A BILL

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research  
at the State agricultural experiment stations.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress  
4       to continue its support of agricultural research at the State  
5       agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds,  
6       on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as  
7       required for the effective conduct of an adequate research  
8       program.

9       SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to assist the State  
10      agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisi-

1 tion, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other  
2 capital facilities (including the acquisition of fixtures and  
3 equipment which are to become a part of such buildings)  
4 which are necessary to more effectively conduct research in  
5 agriculture and sciences related thereto through means of  
6 grants from the Federal Government.

7 SEC. 3. As used in sections 2 to 11, inclusive, of this  
8 Act—

9 (1) the term “State” shall include Puerto Rico;

10 (2) the term “State agricultural experiment station”  
11 means a department established under the direction of a  
12 college or university in any State in accordance with the  
13 Act entitled “An Act donating public lands to the several  
14 States and Territories which may provide colleges for the  
15 benefit of agriculture and mechanic arts”, approved  
16 July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301); or a department other-  
17 wise established pursuant to standards prescribed by the  
18 State, the purpose of which is to conduct agricultural  
19 research; and

20 (3) the term “Secretary” shall mean the Secretary  
21 of Agriculture.

22 SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appro-  
23 priated for allocation to the States for the purposes of section  
24 2 such sums as the Congress deems advisable.

25 (b) (1) One-third of the funds appropriated pursuant



1 to this section for any fiscal year shall be allotted equally  
2 among the States.

3 (2) Two-thirds of the funds appropriated pursuant to  
4 this section for any fiscal year shall be allocated among the  
5 States as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the same  
6 ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural population  
7 of the State bears to the total rural population of all the States  
8 as determined by the last preceding decennial census current  
9 at the time each such sum is first appropriated; and one-half  
10 in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount  
11 to be allotted as the farm population of the State bears to  
12 the total farm population of all the States as determined by  
13 the last preceding decennial census current at the time such  
14 sum is first appropriated.

15 (c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secre-  
16 tary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this Act under  
17 such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as necessary  
18 therefor.

19 SEC. 5. Any State in order to be eligible for payments  
20 from funds allocated pursuant to section 4 shall submit, in  
21 such form as the Secretary may require, specific proposals for  
22 acquisition or construction of physical facilities defined in  
23 section 2 of this Act. No State shall receive any payment for  
24 any such proposal unless such proposal is approved by the  
25 Secretary.

1        SEC. 6. (a) No payment shall be made to any State  
2        under the provisions of section 4 of this Act in any amount  
3        greater than the amount made available by such State from  
4        non-Federal funds for purposes for which payments are made  
5        under section 4 of this Act.

6        (b) Any unused portion of the allotment of any State  
7        for any fiscal year shall remain available, at the option of  
8        such State, for payment to such State for a period of not  
9        more than two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which  
10       such allotment is first made available.

11       SEC. 7. With respect to multiple-purpose physical  
12       facilities, the segment or portion thereof which is to be  
13       utilized for agricultural research shall be the basis for deter-  
14       mination of fund support under this Act.

15       SEC. 8. For each fiscal year that funds are made avail-  
16       able for allocation to States under the provisions of section 4  
17       and section 6 of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain, at  
18       the earliest practicable date during such year, the amount of  
19       the allocation to which each State is entitled, and shall notify  
20       each State in writing promptly thereafter as to the amount  
21       of such allocation.

22       SEC. 9. (a) Any State agricultural experiment station  
23       authorized to receive payments under the provisions of sec-  
24       tion 4 of this Act shall have a chief administrative officer,  
25       to be known as a director, and a treasurer or other officer

1 appointed by the governing board of such station. Such  
2 treasurer or other officer shall receive and account for all  
3 funds paid to such station pursuant to the provisions of this  
4 Act, and shall submit a report, approved by the director  
5 of such station, to the Secretary on or before the first day  
6 of September of each year. Such report shall contain a  
7 detailed statement of the amount received under the pro-  
8 visions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of  
9 its disbursements on schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

10 (b) If any portion of the allotted funds received by the  
11 authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural ex-  
12 periment station shall by any action or contingency be dimin-  
13 ished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be repaid by the State  
14 concerned, and until repaid no part of any subsequent ap-  
15 propriation shall be allocated or paid to such State.

16 SEC. 10. The Secretary shall make an annual report  
17 to the Congress during the first regular session of each year  
18 with respect to (1) payments made under this Act, (2)  
19 the facilities, by States, for which such payments were made,  
20 and (3) whether any portion of the appropriation available  
21 for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the  
22 reasons therefor.

23 SEC. 11. (a) Any agricultural experiment station es-  
24 tablished by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this  
25 Act.

1       (b) With respect to any State in which more than one  
2 agricultural experiment station has been established, any  
3 appropriations allocated for the use of such State pursuant  
4 to the provisions of this Act shall be divided between or  
5 among such institutions as the legislature of such State shall  
6 direct.

7       SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated  
8 such sums as may be necessary for proper administration  
9 of this Act.





---

---

# A BILL

---

---

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

---

---

By Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. AIKEN,  
and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota

---

---

MARCH 14, 1963

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry



**A BILL**

to amend the law relating to the  
the law relating to the  
the law relating to the  
the law relating to the  
the law relating to the  
the law relating to the



# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued May 2, 1963  
For actions of May 1, 1963  
88th-1st, No. 64

### CONTENTS

Appropriation.....6	Economics.....19	Forestry.....13
Budget.....10	Experiment stations.....1	General Supply Fund.....6
Buildings.....3	Export-Import Bank.....2	Monopolies.....11
Cabinet officers.....15	Farm labor.....20	Patents.....25
Civil defense.....6	Farm program.....8	Personnel.....16,21,22
Civil service.....5	Farmer.....17	Population.....4
Claims.....6	Federal Supply Service...6	Price support.....18
Cotton.....8	Feed grain.....8	Public Law 480.....7
Dairy.....8,18	FHA.....6	Public works.....6
Disaster relief.....6	Foreign affairs.....24	Recreation.....6,12
		Research.....1,14
		Supplemental appropriations.....6
		Unemployment.....20
		Virgin Islands.....6
		Water compact.....26
		Watersheds.....9
		Wheat.....7
		Wildlife.....23
		World Food Congress.....6

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee announced hearings on feed grain, dairy, and cotton legislation. Senate committee reported bill to increase durum wheat allotments in Tulare, Calif. Sen. Morse urged Ore. farmers to vote "yes" in wheat referendum. House committee voted to report bill for additional research facilities for experiment stations. Senate subcommittee voted to report Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

### HOUSE

1. RESEARCH. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 40, to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations. p. D279
2. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK. Passed with amendment H. R. 3872, to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years, to increase the bank's authorization for insurance and guarantee from \$1 to \$2 billion, and to increase the limitation on the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding at any time from \$7 to \$9 billion (pp. 7064-73). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Patman changing "the method of financing the increase in lending authority from a back door to an appropriated fund basis" (pp. 7072-3).

3. BUILDINGS. Passed without amendment H. R. 5207, authorizing additional appropriations for foreign buildings including Agricultural Attache housing (pp. 7074-80). Rep. Pool opposed passage of this bill as increasing the "physical comfort of those in the Foreign Service" while at the same time "the United States must borrow money with which to pay its debts" (p. 7081).
4. POPULATION. Rep. Curtis inserted a survey stating that <sup>"Since</sup> the 30 to 44 ages comprise the 'biggest spending and most productive age group,' its failure to grow has had an important impact upon economic growth." p. 7085
5. CIVIL SERVICE. Rep. Widnall complimented the new Civil Service program called Legislative Operations Roundtable for Executives as enhancing "the Federal career executive's knowledge and understanding of executive-legislative relations through an examination in depth of congressional functions and processes, and the relationships between these and executive branch operations." pp. 7085-6

#### SENATE

6. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 5517, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963 (pp. 7133-68). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Saltonstall to provide that the \$450 million for public works acceleration shall remain available until Jan. 31, 1964 (rather than June 30, 1964) (p. 7142). By a vote of 26 to 60, rejected an amendment by Sen. Saltonstall to reduce the amount for the public works acceleration program from \$450 million to \$250 million (pp. 7133, 7135-41). By a vote of 47 to 38, tabled an amendment by Sen. Javits to insert an anti-discrimination clause with respect to funds for the Farmers Home Administration (pp. 7142-5). By a vote of 18 to 65, rejected an amendment by Sen. Young (Ohio) to strike out the item for the Defense Department for civil defense research and for marking and stocking shelter spaces (pp. 7156-60). Conferees were appointed (p. 7168).

Also, the bill includes items for the Commerce Department for transportation research, Defense Department for civil defense research and for marking and stocking shelter spaces, President's disaster relief fund, Public Health Service for grants for establishing and operating family health service clinics for migratory farm workers and their families, GSA General Supply Fund and Federal Supply Service, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Virgin Islands Corporation for salt water distillation facilities and to restore capital losses in sugar operations, State Department for organizing and holding the World Food Congress, and various amounts for payment of judgments and claims against departments and agencies.

A House item was deleted which would have provided \$3,350,000 for the revolving fund of the Virgin Islands Corporation for expanding power facilities.

The Senate concurred in a House provision that departments and agencies absorb five percent of the supplemental requests for increased pay costs.

A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 5366, the Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies appropriation bill for 1964. p. D278

7. WHEAT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with an amendment S. 762, to provide for increased durum wheat acreage allotments in the Tulare lake area, Calif. (S. Rept. 166). p. 7093

Sen. Lausche expressed concern over reports that Public Law 480 shipments of wheat to Poland and Yugoslavia were being trans-shipped to countries behind the Iron Curtain, and inserted a letter from the State Department that they had found no evidence that this was being done. pp. 7116-7







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued May 3, 1963  
For actions of May 2, 1963  
88th-1st; No. 65

Forestry.....	35,38
Housing.....	39
Imports.....	4,38,44
Lands.....	6,40
Legislative program.....	26
Livestock and meats.....	16
National Service	
Corps.....	8,34
Peanuts.....	15,26
Personnel.....	24,32,43
President's program.....	21
Property.....	42
Public debt.....	19,26
Recreation.....	5
Research.....	14,26,36
Retirement.....	24
Rice.....	15
Small business.....	31
Sugar.....	3
Water conservation.....	10
Wheat.....	1,37
Wool.....	4,22

## CONTENTS

Accounting.....	9	Cooperatives.....	2,28
Adjournment.....	13,27	Data processing.....	12
Appropriations.....	17	Electrification.....	2
Area redevelopment.....	30	Employment.....	32
Assistant Secretaries..	29	Experiment stations..	14,26
Budgeting.....	7,20	Farm labor.....	11
Census.....	23	Federal aid.....	33
Committees.....	18	Flood control.....	41
Contracts.....	25	Foreign trade.....	4,38,44

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House committee reported bills for additional research facilities for experiment stations, authorize transfer of rice allotments, and continue exemption of green peanuts from allotments and quotas. Senate passed bill to increase durum wheat allotments in Tulalake, Calif. Sen. Humphrey criticized Federal Power Commission efforts to regulate REA coops. Sen. Tower contended Russia profiting in buying and selling Cuban sugar. House subcommittee voted to report bill to provide that Secretary's authority under Packers and Stockyards Act shall not apply to deductions for promotion and research activities. House committee voted to report bill to increase public debt ceiling. Sen. Carlson introduced and discussed bill to regulate agricultural and forestry imports.

## SENATE

1. WHEAT. Passed as reported S. 762, to provide for permanent increases in durum wheat allotments in the Tulalake area of Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif. pp. 7214-5
2. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Humphrey stated that he "was astounded to learn that the Federal Power Commission recently has moved in the direction of exercising jurisdiction over the rural electric cooperatives," and contended that Congress never intended the Commission to exercise such jurisdiction. pp. 7226-9  
Sen. Douglas commended "the continuing contribution of rural electric cooperatives to our society," and inserted an editorial, "Private Utilities Open War on Rural Electric Co-ops." pp. 7213-4
3. SUGAR. Sen. Tower stated that Russia was making a profit in Cuban sugar by buying sugar at below the world market price and selling it at the world market price, and inserted tables showing the extent of Cuban-Russian trade in



sugar and an article, "Soviet Union Purchases of Cuban Sugar." pp. 7185-7

4. WOOL IMPORTS. Sen. McIntyre criticized increased imports of woolen goods and urged that strong representations be made concerning these imports at coming trade negotiations with European Common Market countries. p. 7222
5. RECREATION. Sen. Hart commended the increasing establishment of recreation facilities in rural areas, stated that "these beautiful rural areas of ours might as readily revitalize their economies by taking advantage of the natural attractions around them as by hustling for industry," and inserted several articles on the subject. pp. 7207-8
6. LANDS. Sen. Bartlett criticized the surveying techniques being used by Interior in surveying public lands in Alaska from which the State will select certain lands resulting from Statehood, urged that the surveys be accelerated and inserted several items on the situation regarding these surveys. pp. 7198-7202
7. BUDGETING. Continued consideration of S. 537, to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Budget composed of members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. p. 7210
8. NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS. Sen. Bartlett commended the proposed establishment of a National Service Corps and described how such a Corps could be used for work in Alaska. pp. 7202-4
9. ACCOUNTING. Sen. Douglas commended the work of the General Accounting Office, stating that it has "saved millions for the taxpayers." pp. 7197-8
10. WATER CONSERVATION. Sen. Sparkman inserted two items discussing the work of TVA in the conservation of water resources. pp. 7190-1
11. FARM LABOR. Sen. Williams (N. J.) submitted for printing a report of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States" (S. Rept. 167). p. 7177
12. DATA PROCESSING. Received from GAO a report "on the review of the excessive cost of leasing compared with buying certain electronic data processing equipment by the Department of the Air Force." p. 7176
13. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 6. p. 7245

HOUSE

14. RESEARCH. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 40, to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations (H. Rept. 271). p. 7286
15. RICE; PEANUTS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3742, relating to the transfer of producer rice acreage allotments (H. Rept. 273) and H. R. 101, to extend for two years the exemption of green peanuts from allotments and quotas (H. Rept. 272). p. 7288
16. LIVESTOCK AND MEATS. The Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 5860, to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act to provide that the authority of the Secretary shall not apply to deductions from the sales proceeds for the purpose of financing promotion or research activities relating to livestock, meats, and other products covered by the Act. p. D285

## EXPERIMENT STATION RESEARCH FACILITIES

---

MAY 2, 1963.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 40]

The Committee on Agriculture to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 40) to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to authorize appropriation of Federal funds, on a matching basis, specifically for the purpose of assisting in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other physical facilities for agricultural research in the State agricultural experiment stations. Lack of adequate facilities has become a serious bottleneck to the full use of available scientific talent in the advancement of technical knowledge toward solution of serious problems in agriculture and related business and industry.

#### NEED

A very substantial part of the tremendous progress which has, in the past few decades, made American agriculture the most efficient in the world, is due to the research work which has been carried out jointly by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the various States in the State agricultural experiment stations. Since 1887, when the Hatch Act was enacted, this work has been carried out cooperatively between the States and the Federal Government, with State funds at least matching the funds made available by the Federal Government. A very large part of the Department's agricultural research is conducted in these State experiment stations.



Since this cooperative research program has been in operation for more than 70 years, and most of the experiment stations were established early in the program, many of the buildings, laboratories, and other facilities are far from modern. Many of them, constructed primarily for research in agricultural production, are not suitable for research in the utilization of agricultural commodities, for the basic research increasingly necessary to develop new uses, nor for employment of the advanced techniques, equipment, and methods which have become available in recent years.

In 1955, Congress recognized the urgent need to improve and modernize the physical facilities of the State experiment stations and amended the Hatch Act (7 U.S.C. 361d) to authorize the use of funds appropriated thereunder "for the purchase and rental of land and the construction, acquisition, alteration, or repair of buildings necessary for conducting research."

For several reasons this authority has not been used. Traditionally, Hatch Act funds have been used almost exclusively for research operations and not for facilities. There is no requirement in the existing law of approval of facility construction in advance by the Secretary in order to avoid duplication or unnecessary expenditures. There is no authority in the existing law for funds allotted to a State to be carried over from one fiscal year to another, making construction of a major facility with matching funds virtually impossible. For these reasons, among others, the Department of Agriculture has not requested nor has the Congress appropriated any funds specifically for the purpose of research facility construction and improvement, although Congress has clearly recognized the need for such a program.

This bill will provide the specific authorization and guidelines for cooperative Federal-State action in bringing about much needed modernization and improvement of the physical facilities for research at the State experiment stations.

#### HEARINGS

H.R. 40 is identical with H.R. 12712 of the 87th Congress which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture on August 8, 1962, and passed the House unanimously on August 30, 1962, too late for action in the Senate at that session. In view of the extensive hearings and discussions which preceded favorable action on H.R. 12712, additional hearings on this identical bill were felt to be unnecessary. H.R. 40 was also reported from the Committee on Agriculture without a dissenting vote.

The subject matter of H.R. 40 has been under consideration by the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities for several years—ever since it became apparent that the authority for facility construction added to the Hatch Act in 1955 was not going to be an effective vehicle for the accomplishment of this objective. The recommendations of the association were embodied in H.R. 890, 87th Congress, which was introduced on January 3, 1961, by Mr. Abernethy. Subsequently, identical bills were introduced by Mr. Albert (H.R. 6661), Mr. Reifel (H.R. 7064), Mr. Harvey of Indiana (H.R. 7480), and Mr. Steed (H. R. 7838).

Hearings on these bills were deferred until March 5, 1962, in order to give all those interested in the subject matter an opportunity for thorough study of the proposed legislation. At the hearings the



measure was strongly supported by the Department of Agriculture, by the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, and by experiment station directors from various parts of the United States. The proposal was also endorsed by the general farm organizations but with the reservation that before a program of facility construction is undertaken, there should be a more precise determination of the direction and character of the research work to be carried out at the State agricultural experiment stations.

The committee believes that the normal course of legislative procedure and the requirements of the bill itself will assure that the objective of the farm organizations will be carried out. If the bill is enacted into law, appropriations to implement it will not be made, at the earliest, until the following fiscal year. Tentative allotments of the funds made available will then be made to the respective States on the basis of the formula in the bill, but none of this money will actually be made available to the States until the specific building projects proposed by the States have been approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Thus, a period of at least a year will elapse from the time this bill might be enacted into law until the time when any payments to the States might be made thereunder. Several studies of the basic direction and objectives of agricultural research are now underway, one of these by the House Appropriations Committee itself, and the committee believes that the results of these studies and the policy determinations arising therefrom will have been well established by the time any funds which might be appropriated under this bill will be available to the States.

#### CLEAN BILL

As the result of the year of study following introduction of H.R. 890 in the 87th Congress and of testimony at the hearings, several changes were made in the original bill and a clean bill (H.R. 12712) was drafted by the subcommittee and introduced by its chairman, Mr. Abernethy.

The committee omitted from H.R. 12712, and has omitted from this bill, the congressional declarations and findings which had been included in H.R. 890 because it believed that this part of the bill was unnecessary from a legal standpoint. It concurs in these declarations and findings, however, and intends that they should be a part of the legislative history of this measure. They are, accordingly, hereby made a part of this report, as follows:

The Congress of the United States hereby makes the following declarations and findings concerning the efficient production, marketing, and utilization of products of the farm and forest, effective and profitable management of farming as a business, and maintenance of a balanced and sound agricultural economy consistent with the total national economy:

(a) Efficient production and low unit cost to the grower are essential to meet the cost-price squeeze always faced by the farmer.

(b) Efficient production is necessary if adequate supplies of quality food and fiber are to continue to be available at reasonable prices to the food and textile industries, and if the end products thereof are to be available to consumers at reasonable prices.

(c) Marketing efficiencies at all points from the farm, ranch, and forest to the ultimate consumer contribute to the economy and welfare of the grower, processor, handler, and consumer of products of the farm and forest.

(d) New and improved uses of existing farm and forest products will become economically feasible only as the raw commodity is made available to the processor at a price that is competitive with alternative raw commodities.

(e) Further improvements in the management of farms and forests by operators thereof are essential if maximum efficiencies are to be realized in the use of physical financial and human resources for greatest benefit to all concerned with food, fiber, and forest products.

(f) Increased knowledge and better understanding of the factors relating to total supplies and effective market demand of products of the farm and forest, and of the place of agriculture and related commerce and industry in the total national economy are essential to a balanced and sound agricultural economy.

(g) Expanded research and development in the adaptation of existing knowledge to the production, marketing, and utilization of products of the farm and forest are required to continue and improve upon the feeding, clothing, housing, and otherwise attending the physical wants and needs of all of our people, and to allow reasonable profits to all segments of agriculture and related commerce and industry.

(h) An expanded program of basic research in the physical and biological sciences and economics related to agriculture is needed to open the way for important advances in the food and fiber industry of the United States.

(i) The Federal Government has supported agricultural research conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for nearly 100 years, and has made grant funds available to the State agricultural experiment stations for more than 70 years. A large portion of the total research effort of the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations is cooperative and combined effort on a joint research program.

(j) Whereas the States heretofore have financed the major physical facilities for agricultural research at the State experiment stations from non-Federal funds largely, they (the States) now are falling behind in meeting expanded needs for facilities for this research. The shortage of needed facilities is intensified by the expanded operating research program which is financed in part by the Federal-grant funds, and by the presence in the States of Department of Agriculture research personnel working on cooperative Federal-State programs.

It is further noted that lack of facilities has become a bottleneck to successful operation of an adequate research program.

(k) It is recognized that adequate facilities are required if the research noted in (g) and (h), above, is to be accomplished; and that such research is essential if the people of this Nation, present and future generations, are to realize



the most from American agriculture as noted in (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), above.

The committee also eliminated as unnecessary from a legal standpoint a section of H.R. 890 which had stated that authorities under this legislation are in addition and not in substitution for authorities otherwise available under existing law. Since the bill does not repeal, either directly or by implication, any existing provision of law, it is quite clear that the authority conferred herein is additional authority and is not in substitution for nor derogation of any related authority in existing law.

The committee also deleted as unnecessary a provision which would have restricted use of the funds authorized herein to structures costing more than \$20,000. The committee understands that funds for minor structures or improvements are now available under other authority and, since all structures and facilities which may be included under the authority of this legislation must be approved in advance by the Secretary of Agriculture, the committee assumes that the Secretary will follow the policy of not approving structures under this authority costing less than \$20,000.

The committee also eliminated authority to use funds which might be appropriated pursuant to this legislation for the purchase of land. Since most of the facilities which might be constructed hereunder will be built on the campuses of land-grant colleges and State universities, there appears to be no substantial need for the use of these funds for land acquisition.

Also eliminated from the original draft of the bill was a pooling provision which would have established a pool of funds allocated to States but not used by the States to which allocated. This pool would then have been drawn upon by other States with facility programs approved by the Secretary in excess of currently available allocations.

#### DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Following is the letter from the Department of Agriculture recommending enactment of this legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
*Washington, D.C., March 5, 1962.*

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 1, 1961, giving us the opportunity to report on H.R. 890. The bill is entitled to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

This bill would further support agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds on a matching basis to help finance physical facilities needed for the conduct of an adequate research program. Sums appropriated for such purposes would be allocated—(1) one-third equally to each State; (2) two-thirds on the basis of—(a) one-half on ratio of rural population of a State to the total rural population of all States; and (b) one-half on ratio of farm population of a State to the total farm population of all States, with provisions for accumulating formula funds for up to 3 years. Funds under this formula which are not used by any State

become available for use by other States on a matching basis with a \$500,000 maximum limitation to any State. Facilities must cost more than \$20,000 each. It provides authority to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration, including limitations, accountability, and reporting requirements to the Congress.

H.R. 890 would amend, clarify, and strengthen an authorization of long standing. A general authority for the construction of facilities for agricultural research at State agricultural experiment stations is provided under 7 U.S.C. 361d. However, sums appropriated for payments to State agricultural experiment stations have been used primarily by these stations for the conduct of research. The limited use of such grant funds for facilities has been due in part to the inability of the individual States to accumulate sufficient funds for major capital outlays even with matching State funds. This proposed bill would, therefore, provide a workable mechanism and an amplification of the existing authorization whereby funds appropriated through annual appropriations would enable the States to plan needed facilities in support of an agricultural research program. The bill also provides for a sound formula for the distribution of allotments to the various States for construction of such facilities. The States in turn would match Federal funds. There is no commitment on the part of the Federal Government or individual States for the appropriation of any definite amounts.

In recent years, the need for adequate physical facilities for the conduct of agricultural research has been recognized by both the States and the Federal Government. Many of the research programs of the State agricultural experiment stations and those of the Federal Government are a joint cooperative enterprise and there is a close working relationship. We cooperate formally on more than half of our research and informally on most of the rest. This Federal-State cooperative system is largely responsible for the outstanding progress that has been made in agricultural research during the past 75 years.

This Department favors the enactment of H.R. 890. This proposed legislation would provide an orderly procedure for the development and planning of long-range physical facilities needed in connection with the joint Federal-State agricultural research program. Funds to carry out the purposes of this bill would come within the annual budget process.

The Department independently and in cooperation with other agencies conducts basic research and the applied research involved in the solution of national and regional problems. The State stations also conduct basic research and applied research on problems of local and regional significance. These two programs are so interrelated that they could hardly be separated without serious damage to the whole program. Weakening of this interrelationship and the promotion of each program separately would create competition for scarce funds and personnel to the detriment of each program. Experience shows that the Federal Department of Agriculture and State experiment stations work most efficiently together. Accordingly, whatever further obligations may be placed on agricultural research are in large measure obligations upon the entire research structure, Federal and State. We recognize that the States have both immediate and future needs for research facilities. The Department of Agriculture has similar needs. We believe these needs should be met as rapidly as can be done.



We have about 2,300 Federal employees working on college campuses and State-owned field stations and spend approximately \$20 million at these locations. Pressure on available facilities is making it increasingly difficult to maintain the current program and places a severe limitation on orderly expansion and development.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program. Enclosed is a copy of the Bureau's letter on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, *Secretary*.

#### ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

*Policy.*—Section 1 is the declaration of congressional policy to support agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations by assisting, on a fund-matching basis, the construction and acquisition of physical facilities.

*Purpose.*—Section 2 states that the purpose of the act is to assist the State agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other capital facilities necessary to the more effective research in agriculture and related sciences. It makes it clear that funds appropriated hereunder may be spent for fixtures and equipment only when these will be a part of the buildings in which they are housed.

*Definition.*—Section 3 includes Puerto Rico in the definition of "State" and defines State agricultural experiment stations as a department established pursuant to the act of July 2, 1862, providing for the establishment of the land-grant colleges. This definition is modified, however, by section 11 of the bill which makes it clear that any agricultural experiment station established by State law, whether on the campus of a land-grant college or not, is to be eligible for benefits under this act.

*Appropriation: allocation.*—Section 4 authorizes appropriations for the purposes of section 2 of the bill and provides for allocation of such funds as may be appropriated on the following basis: One-third to be allotted equally among the States; one-third to be allocated on the basis of the rural population of the States; and one-third to be allocated on the basis of the farm population of the States. It is to be noted that this is an allocation only and that no funds will actually be paid to any State except under performance under the act.

*Eligibility.*—Section 5 provides that before any State is eligible for payment of any part of the funds allotted to it, it must submit, pursuant to regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture, specific proposals for the acquisition of construction of the physical facilities to be added to the experiment station and that funds will be available to the States hereunder only when such specific proposal is approved by the Secretary.

*Matching.*—Section 6 provides that Federal funds must be at least matched by State funds and that funds allocated to a State may, at its option, be carried over for not to exceed 2 fiscal years before they are actually used. This will permit a State to plan a major structure as part of its facilities program and use the Federal allocation available to it in 3 consecutive fiscal years in connection with the construction of such a structure.

*Multiple-purpose facilities.*—Section 7 makes it clear that where a multiple-purpose structure is proposed, such as one which will include both classrooms and laboratory facilities, only that part of the structure which is actually to be used for agricultural research will be eligible for Federal assistance under this act.

*Notification.*—Section 8 provides that the Secretary shall allocate to the States, pursuant to the formula set out in section 4, any appropriations which are made to carry out the purposes of this act and shall notify each State, as soon as practicable, the amount of its allocation.

*Fiscal accountability.*—Section 9 provides that each experiment station authorized to receive payments under this act shall have a treasurer or other officer appointed by the governing board of the station who will receive and account for all funds paid to the station pursuant to the provisions of this act. That official is also required to submit a report to the Secretary of Agriculture on or before the first day of September of each year containing, on schedules prescribed by the Secretary, a detailed statement of the amount received pursuant to this act during the preceding fiscal year and disbursements thereof. The section also provides that if any portion of the allotted funds received by the authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experiment station shall be diminished, lost, or misapplied, it must be repaid to the Federal Government by the State concerned and until it is repaid no part of any subsequent appropriation may be allocated or paid to such State.

*Report to Congress.*—Section 10 requires the Secretary to make an annual report to Congress showing payments made under the act, the facilities by States for which such payments were made, and any allotment which has been withheld from any State and the reason therefor.

*Off-campus experiment stations.*—Section 11 provides that any agricultural experiment station established by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this act and that in a State having more than one eligible experiment station, the division of the Federal allocation between such station shall be made by the legislature of that State.

*Administration.*—Section 12 authorizes appropriations for the administration of this act.





88TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

Union Calendar No. 105

# H. R. 40

[Report No. 271]

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 9, 1963

Mr. ABERNETHY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MAY 2, 1963

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union  
and ordered to be printed

---

## A BILL

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research  
at the State agricultural experiment stations.

1      *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2      *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3      That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to  
4      continue its support of agricultural research at the State  
5      agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds,  
6      on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as  
7      required for the effective conduct of an adequate research  
8      program.

9      SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to assist the State  
10     agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisi-  
11     tion, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other

1 capital facilities (including the acquisition of fixtures and  
2 equipment which are to become a part of such buildings)  
3 which are necessary to more effectively conduct research in  
4 agriculture and sciences related thereto through means of  
5 grants from the Federal Government.

6 SEC. 3. As used in sections 2 to 11, inclusive, of this  
7 Act—

8 (1) the term “State” shall include Puerto Rico;

9 (2) the term “State agricultural experiment sta-  
10 tion” means a department established under the direc-  
11 tion of a college or university in any State in accord-  
12 ance with the Act entitled “An Act donating public  
13 lands to the several States and Territories which may  
14 provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and me-  
15 chanic arts”, approved July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301) ;  
16 or a department otherwise established pursuant to  
17 standards prescribed by the State the purpose of which  
18 is to conduct agricultural research; and

19 (3) the term “Secretary” shall mean the Secre-  
20 tary of Agriculture.

21 SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appro-  
22 priated for allocation to the States for the purposes of sec-  
23 tion 2 such sums as the Congress deems advisable.

1 (b) (1) One-third of the funds appropriated pursuant  
2 to this section for any fiscal year shall be allotted equally  
3 among the States.

4 (2) Two-thirds of the funds appropriated pursuant to  
5 this section for any fiscal year shall be allocated among the  
6 States as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the  
7 same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural  
8 population of the State bears to the total rural population of  
9 all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial  
10 census current at the time each such sum is first appropri-  
11 ated; and one-half in an amount which bears the same ratio  
12 to the total amount to be allotted as the farm population of  
13 the State bears to the total farm population of all the States  
14 as determined by the last preceding decennial census current  
15 at the time such sum is first appropriated.

16 (c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secre-  
17 tary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this Act  
18 under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as neces-  
19 sary therefor.

20 SEC. 5. Any State in order to be eligible for payments  
21 from funds allocated pursuant to section 4 shall submit, in  
22 such form as the Secretary may require, specific proposals  
23 for acquisition or construction of physical facilities defined in



1 section 2 of this Act. No State shall receive any payment  
2 for any such proposal unless such proposal is approved by  
3 the Secretary.

4 SEC. 6. (a) No payment shall be made to any State  
5 under the provisions of section 4 of this Act in any amount  
6 greater than the amount made available by such State  
7 from non-Federal funds for purposes for which payments  
8 are made under section 4 of this Act.

9 (b) Any unused portion of the allotment of any State  
10 for any fiscal year shall remain available, at the option of  
11 such State, for payment to such State for a period of not  
12 more than two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which  
13 such allotment is first made available.

14 SEC. 7. With respect to multiple-purpose physical facili-  
15 ties, the segment or portion thereof which is to be utilized for  
16 agricultural research shall be the basis for determination of  
17 fund support under this Act.

18 SEC. 8. For each fiscal year that funds are made avail-  
19 able for allocation to States under the provisions of section 4  
20 and section 6 of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain, at  
21 the earliest practicable date during such year, the amount  
22 of the allocation to which each State is entitled, and shall  
23 notify each State in writing promptly thereafter as to the  
24 amount of such allocation.

25 SEC. 9. (a) Any State agricultural experiment station

1 authorized to receive payments under the provisions of  
2 section 4 of this Act shall have a chief administrative officer,  
3 to be known as a director, and a treasurer or other officer  
4 appointed by the governing board of such station. Such  
5 treasurer or other officer shall receive and account for all  
6 funds paid to such station pursuant to the provisions of this  
7 Act, and shall submit a report, approved by the director of  
8 such station, to the Secretary on or before the first day of  
9 September of each year. Such report shall contain a de-  
10 tailed statement of the amount received under the provisions  
11 of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its dis-  
12 bursements on schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

13 (b) If any portion of the allotted funds received by the  
14 authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experi-  
15 ment station shall by any action or contingency be dimin-  
16 ished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be repaid by the State  
17 concerned, and until repaid no part of any subsequent appro-  
18 priation shall be allocated or paid to such State.

19 SEC. 10. The Secretary shall make an annual report to  
20 the Congress during the first regular session of each year  
21 with respect to (1) payments made under this Act, (2)  
22 the facilities, by States, for which such payments were made,  
23 and (3) whether any portion of the appropriation available  
24 for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the  
25 reasons therefor.



1        SEC. 11. (a) Any agricultural experiment station estab-  
2        lished by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this  
3        Act.

4        (b) With respect to any State in which more than one  
5        agricultural experiment station has been established, any  
6        appropriations allocated for the use of such State pursuant  
7        to the provisions of this Act shall be divided between or  
8        among such institutions as the legislature of such State shall  
9        direct.

10       SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated  
11       such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of  
12       this Act.



88TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

H. R. 40

[Report No. 271]

# A BILL

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

By Mr. ABERNETHY

JANUARY 9, 1963

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MAY 2, 1963

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued May 7, 1963  
For actions of May 6, 1963  
88th-1st; No. 66



## CONTENTS

Adjournment.....9	Feed grains.....2,18,33	Mexican labor.....12
Appropriations.....1,10	Foreign agriculture....23	Migratory labor.....3
Area redevelopment.....13	Foreign trade.....25	Packers and stockyards..14
Budgeting.....7,41	Forestry.....10,20,30	Peanuts.....17
Contracts.....45	Grain shipments.....46	Personnel.....22,29,34,44
Education.....16,24,42	Health.....29,31	Public debt.....21
Electrification.....4	Lands.....28,40	Public works.....10,32
Experiment stations....11	Legislative program....8	Recreation.....10
Farm labor.....3,12	Lobbying.....34	Research.....11
Farm program.....26	Manpower.....27,43	Retirement.....44
		Sugar.....19,37
		Supplemental appropriations.....10
		Surplus property.....39
		Taxation.....6
		Transportation.....38,46
		Virgin Islands.....10
		Vocational education....24
		Water pollution.....5
		Watersheds.....15
		Wheat.....26,36
		Youth corps.....35

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. Rep. Findley charged Secretary used "inaccurate statistics" to justify feed-grain program. Rep. Vanik criticized increase in price of sugar. House passed experiment station research facilities bill. House committee voted to report Packers and Stockyards bill re deductions for promotion and research activities. House committees reported bills to: Extend Mexican farm labor program; amend Area Redevelopment Act. Senate committee reported Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. Sen. Proxmire voiced support for feed grain bill. Senate subcommittee approved (May 3) various migratory labor bills.

## SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee (on May 3, during adjournment) reported with amendments H. R. 5366, the Treasury-Post Office, Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies appropriation bill for 1964 (S. Rept. 168).
2. FEED GRAINS. Sen. Proxmire voiced support of the feed grain bill especially since it contains provisions for voluntary participation in the program. pp. 7332-3
3. MIGRATORY LABOR. The Migratory Labor Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee (on May 3, during adjournment) voted to report to the full committee the following bills: S. 521, to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children; S. 522, to assist States in providing for day-care services

for children of migrant agricultural workers; S. 523, to extend the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to certain children employed in agriculture; S. 524, to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers; S. 525, to establish a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor; and S. 526, to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers. p. D290

4. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Randolph inserted a speech by Mr. Lilienthal urging continued use of coal rather than continued research on atomic power from electricity, because of the waste disposal problem of atomic energy. pp. 7324-30
5. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Morse inserted an Ore. Legislature memorial asking funds for water pollution research at Oregon State University. p. 7330
6. TAXATION. Sen. Proxmire inserted an article stating that interest rates will become higher if the proposed tax cut is approved. pp. 7333-4
7. BUDGETING. Continued consideration of S. 537, to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government. pp. 7332, 7338-9
8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that on Wed., May 8, "the Senate will consider the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill; the Treasury-Post Office, and Executive Offices appropriation bill; and also the unfinished business, S. 537, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946." p. 7332
9. ADJOURNED until Wed. May 8. p. 7341

#### HOUSE

10. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 5517, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963 (H. Rept. 275) (pp. 7354-6). Attached to this Digest a table showing action on items in this Department. Restored House language under the public works acceleration item "amended to require a financial contribution from State or local sources for any Federal project except projects dealing with preservation of forests in the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. The exception for forests is intended to cover National Parks, forest, and Indians." Struck out language proposed by the House to appropriate \$3,350,000 for the revolving fund of the Virgin Island Corporation for expanding power facilities. Appropriates \$100,000 for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation as proposed by the Senate instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House. See Digest 64 for other items of interest.
11. RESEARCH. By a vote of 274 to 30, passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 4996 to authorize the appropriation of Federal funds, on a matching basis, specifically for the purpose of assisting in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other physical facilities for agricultural research in State agricultural experiment stations. pp. 7369-74
12. FARM LABOR. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5497, to extend the Mexican farm labor program through Dec. 31, 1965 (H. Rept. 274). p. 7401
13. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4996, to increase the authorizations for programs under the Area Redevelopment Act (H. Rept. 276). p. 7401



Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I speak for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole], as well as myself, when I say that we are heartily in sympathy with the objective of protecting farmers from governmental control. Of course, that is exactly what is proposed here. Our objective in the bill is too restrictive. The same blessings of freedom from governmental control should be extended to all peanut producers and not just that small group of peanut producers which may be producing peanuts for boiling.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a rather restricted parliamentary situation today. I checked with the Parliamentarian on the possibility of amending the bill. Not even under a unanimous consent request can the bill be amended.

There is no course for us who believe in a marketplace system and would like to extend the same blessings of freedom to all peanut producers but to oppose suspending the rules. In that way the bill likely would stay on the Union Calendar, and, we may hope, would be scheduled by the House Rules Committee under an open rule so the House could then work its will and make a determination by a vote here on the floor of the House as to whether or not all peanut farmers should be set free.

The effect of H.R. 101 is to protect part of the peanut crop—that intended for use as boiled peanuts—from supply management.

It is a milestone of some sort that the Committee on Agriculture finds it necessary, and wise, occasionally to pass a bill to protect American farmers from Government control—the plain-language term for supply management.

It is even more noteworthy that the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, America's foremost advocate of supply management, favors this protection for the producers of peanuts for boiling. His only criticism of the bill is that it does not provide permanent protection from Government control. He recommends that this protection be permanent.

This same protection should be extended to all peanut farmers, and, indeed, to all farmers and all farm commodities.

Meanwhile, congratulations to this small but happy group of farmers who have been able to get Government protection from Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present,

and object to the vote on the ground that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 37]

Addabbo	Ford	Morrison
Alger	Forrester	Morton
Anderson	Fountain	Multer
Ashmore	Friedel	Nedzi
Aspinall	Gallagher	Nix
Auchincloss	Garmatz	O'Konski
Ayres	Gary	O'Neill
Barrett	Glaimo	Osmer
Beermann	Gilbert	Patten
Belcher	Goodell	Pepper
Berry	Gooding	Philbin
Blatnik	Grabowski	Powell
Bolling	Grant	Purcell
Bolton,	Gray	Quillen
Frances P.	Grover	Rains
Brademas	Hagan, Ga.	Reid, Ill.
Bromwell	Halleck	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	Halpern	Roberts, Ala.
Buckley	Hanna	Rodino
Cahill	Hawkins	Roosevelt
Carey	Healey	Rostenkowski
Callier	Hébert	Roush
Chamberlain	Hemphill	Ryan, Mich.
Chell	Hoffman	St. George
Cleveland	Holifield	St. Germain
Collier	Hull	Saylor
Conte	Jarman	Scott
Cooley	Jennings	Shelley
Corbett	Karh	Sheppard
Cramer	Kee	Shriver
Davis, Tenn.	Keith	Sibal
Dawson	Kirwan	Smith, Iowa
Delaney	Knox	Staggers
Dent	Kornegay	Steed
Derounian	Lloyd	Stratton
Diggs	Long, La.	Utt
Downing	Maddonald	Walter
Dulski	Madden	Watson
Elliott	Martin, Mass.	Whalley
Farbstein	Michel	Widnall
Finnegan	Miller, N.Y.	Wilson
Fino	Minish	Charles H.
Fisher	Monagan	Wyman
Fogarty	Moorhead	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 302 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### PEANUTS FOR BOILING

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to suspend the rules and call up the bill under consideration be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education be allowed to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

#### EXPERIMENT STATION RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 40) to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to continue its support of agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds, on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as required for the effective conduct of an adequate research program.

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to assist the State agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other capital facilities (including the acquisition of fixtures and equipment which are to become a part of such buildings) which are necessary to more effectively conduct research in agriculture and sciences related thereto through means of grants from the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. As used in sections 2 to 11, inclusive, of this Act—

(1) the term "State" shall include Puerto Rico;

(2) the term "State agricultural experiment station" means a department established under the direction of a college or university in any State in accordance with the Act entitled "An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and mechanic arts", approved July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301); or a department otherwise established pursuant to standards prescribed by the State the purpose of which is to conduct agricultural research; and

(3) the term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for allocation to the States for the purposes of section 2 such sums as the Congress deems advisable.

(b) (1) One-third of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be allotted equally among the States.

(2) Two-thirds of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be allocated among the States as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural population of the State bears to the total rural population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time each such sum is first appropriated; and one-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the farm population of the State bears to the total farm population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time such sum is first appropriated.

(c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secretary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this Act under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as necessary therefor.

SEC. 5. Any State in order to be eligible for payments from funds allocated pursuant to section 4 shall submit, in such form as the Secretary may require, specific proposals for acquisition or construction of physical facilities defined in section 2 of this Act. No State shall receive any payment for any such proposal unless such proposal is approved by the Secretary.



Sec. 6. (a) No payment shall be made to any State under the provisions of section 4 of this Act in any amount greater than the amount made available by such State from non-Federal funds for purposes for which payments are made under section 4 of this Act.

(b) Any unused portion of the allotment of any State for any fiscal year shall remain available, at the option of such State, for payment to such State for a period of not more than two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such allotment is first made available.

Sec. 7. With respect to multiple-purpose physical facilities, the segment or portion thereof which is to be utilized for agricultural research shall be the basis for determination of fund support under this Act.

Sec. 8. For each fiscal year that funds are made available for allocation to States under the provisions of section 4 and section 6 of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain, at the earliest practicable date during such year, the amount of the allocation to which each State is entitled, and shall notify each State in writing promptly thereafter as to the amount of such allocation.

Sec. 9. (a) Any State agricultural experiment station authorized to receive payments under the provisions of section 4 of this Act shall have a chief administrative officer, to be known as a director, and a treasurer or other officer appointed by the governing board of such station. Such treasurer or other officer shall receive and account for all funds paid to such station pursuant to the provisions of this Act, and shall submit a report, approved by the director of such station, to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year. Such report shall contain a detailed statement of the amount received under the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursements on schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) If any portion of the allotted funds received by the authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experiment station shall by any action or contingency be diminished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be repaid by the State concerned, and until repaid no part of any subsequent appropriation shall be allocated or paid to such State.

Sec. 10. The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress during the first regular session of each year with respect to (1) payments made under this Act, (2) the facilities, by States, for which such payments were made, and (3) whether any portion of the appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor.

Sec. 11. (a) Any agricultural experiment station established by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this Act.

(b) With respect to any State in which more than one agricultural experiment station has been established, any appropriations allocated for the use of such State pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be divided between or among such institutions as the legislature of such State shall direct.

Sec. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. (Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 40, comes to the House with the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Agriculture. This is the second time that the Committee on Agriculture has reported this legislation. It was first reported in the last Congress and passed on the 30th day of August 1962, without any objection whatsoever from the floor. It reached the Senate too late for consideration over there.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan measure. It has had the endorsement of the previous Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, as well as Secretary Freeman.

Companion bills have been introduced by various Members of the House. Authors of companion bills are the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], and probably others.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to assist the States in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of their agricultural experiment stations. Actually, this is not a new program. I will say to the Members of the House that there is already authority for Federal grants to State experiment stations but there is no particular formula under which the funds are to be distributed.

The principal objective of the bill is to provide an equitable formula for the distribution of grants among the States, which formula will be more or less comparable to that under which funds are now distributed to the Extension Service in the various States.

Mr. Speaker, the formula specifically provides that one-third of the funds shall be allocated to the States on an equal basis, another one-third on the basis of the rural population of each State, and the remaining one-third on the basis of farm population.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that many of the facilities of our agricultural experiment stations are now quite old and very antiquated. They do not fit into the need of a modern, scientific research operation. Agriculture is now faced with many new plant and animal diseases, blights, insects, pests, and so on. Improvement in existing experiment and laboratory facilities is quite essential to meet this threat and to advance new uses and better marketing of agricultural commodities.

Mr. Speaker, I think this covers the high points of the bill. I shall be glad to yield to any Member who desires to propound a question.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I think the bill is a good one and I am in favor of it. Fine work has been done by the experiment stations. May I inquire of the gentleman whether there is any estimate as to the amount of funds that would be needed under this program? There is nothing in the bill itself that gives any estimate as to what

we may be entering into in the way of funding.

Mr. ABERNETHY. This bill simply authorizes that the moneys be distributed to the States under the formula that I have just mentioned. To be a little more specific, the directors of the experiment stations, under the leadership of Dr. Hawkins, of Oklahoma State University, as well as witnesses from the Department of Agriculture, testified that there was now a need for about \$12 million of Federal funds for this purpose.

Mr. BOW. Do I understand the gentleman estimates that about \$12 million will be used and will cover the experiment stations in the various States?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That covers current needs according to the testimony brought to us by the people who operate these stations and by the people in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BOW. On the question of the financing program, section 12 authorizes appropriated sums that may be necessary for the proper administration of the act. Will the gentleman give us some idea what the cost of the administration of the act will be.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I should not think there would be an additional dime of administrative cost. I do not see how there could be because already we have people in the Department of Agriculture who are administering an almost identical program, except that the distribution of funds is not made under the formula to which I have referred.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman feels that the adoption of this legislation would not mean that we are creating any more positions?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I certainly would not think so; no, sir.

Mr. BOW. And that the appropriation for administration would be about the same as it has been in the past?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Exactly.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding to me because I do serve on the committee that will have to fund any result of this action. I am happy to see—and I read at this time from the report:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize appropriation of Federal funds, on a matching basis, specifically for the purpose of assisting in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other physical facilities for agricultural research in the State agricultural experiment stations.

I make note of the word "specifically" and I assume my colleague from Mississippi intends that to mean exactly the way it sounds; that is true, is it not?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is not my word; that is what the gentleman finds in the report. I might say to my friend from Washington that this bill sets up the ground rules for the distribution of Federal grants among the States for the erection, repair or construction of experiment stations and facilities, which incidentally are now authorized by law.



Mr. HORAN. I understand, I think, and when the agriculture appropriations bill is on the floor I will be specific myself in informing the House of Representatives that our State agricultural experiment stations in 1962 spent \$15.5 million of Federal funds that were not budgeted or, if they were, it did not come to the attention of the Bureau of the Budget, and it did not come to the attention of our subcommittee; and in 1963, and I have the list here, transfers from other departments to State experiment stations totaled \$16,581,181 that was not budgeted per se, did not come to us in the justifications, and was not handled through the Bureau of the Budget. They were funds that we had appropriated here to other departments and agencies, who in turn transferred this Federal money to State experiment stations without informing the Congress, our subcommittee, the Department, or the Bureau of the Budget of these transfers. It is reasonable to assume that this further \$1 million that I am talking about as between 1962 and 1963, the current year, has helped to build up the stature of our State experiment stations to the point where it would be an additional argument for your bill here. But I do contend that it undermines the principle of appropriation of Federal moneys, and some stop has to be put to it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman has rendered a real service in calling these points to the attention of the House. Of course, the gentleman is not making a point on this particular bill. What he is saying is that certain other funds have been made available to the experiment stations and that his subcommittee was not accorded the information.

Mr. HORAN. We have no control over nor are we interested in the funds that go to the State experiment stations, and I am one of the advocates of the State experiment stations. We have no control over the contributions of individuals or the States. But as members of the Appropriations Committee we are charged with the responsibility of looking into the funds that are included in the regular appropriation.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I strongly favor the purposes of H.R. 40, to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations. I support heartily the declaration that it is the policy of the U.S. Congress to continue its support of agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds, on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as required for the effective conduct of an adequate research program.

I believe it should be pointed out that these State agricultural experiment stations are performing a fine function in the research and development of agriculture in this country, as well as in improving the quality of products and

bettering distribution and marketing procedures.

One of the best provisions of this type of approach is that the States provide matching funds, so that there is obtained local responsibility and local contribution as well as Federal grants and responsibility in order to insure the good use of the moneys appropriated. As a Congressman representing an industrial area, I believe that this U.S. agriculture policy is good, not only for the farmers, the processors, distributors, and the business community, but also for the consumers. This is a type of agriculture and farm policy of the Federal Government which I strongly favor, and recommend that it continue, especially on the basis of having the individual States participate.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman whether or not this is a new expenditure or bricks and mortar rather than an operational expenditure.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, it is not a new expenditure. There is already authority in law for making grants to the States for these purposes. Grants up to \$90,000 can be made without any matching at all. The grants referred to in this bill are to be made under a matching formula, dollar for dollar, under a formula which would afford each State a fair share.

Mr. HOSMER. However, the authority for matching in amounts in excess of \$20,000 under the Hatch Act of 1955 has not been exercised; is that correct?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I just do not have sufficient information on that point to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOSMER. According to the report of the gentleman's committee, this is the case and as a consequence I think this is, in effect, a new spending program. I direct the gentleman's attention to the estimate of cost of some \$12 million annually.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is not an annual cost. An estimate was made that they now have a need of only \$12 million of Federal funds. That may not be the situation 5 years or 10 years from now. All of these programs are on a continuing basis. Taking the Extension Service, for example, there is no way anyone can estimate what the eventual overall cost of the extension program would be.

Mr. HOSMER. There are at least 100 of these State extension services facilities that would be involved; are there not?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not know how many would be involved. I do not think there would be too many. I think the testimony shows that only about 20 States have plans now for expanding their facilities. There may be more, I just do not know.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I think this program is a poor one and should be defeated at this time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I regret the gentleman feels as he does and I respectfully disagree with him. This is a good program. Through our experiment stations American Agriculture has moved toward heights unexcelled anywhere in the world. Through this program and particularly the authority in this bill, we hope to provide more markets and more uses for our farm commodities. This is a good bill. It is good legislation. It is a good program. I sincerely hope this House will pass this bill.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. I think we have shown in the past that the really effective assistance the Federal Government gives to American agriculture is through research. This bill provides the formula whereby each State will be able to construct the buildings needed for research. The peculiar problems of agriculture in a particular State can only be handled by the State itself. In this bill, each State receives money according to a formula. I think H.R. 40 is an improvement to make the present law workable and in view of the purposes of the bill, I give it my wholehearted support.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. And I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] for his continued efforts and leadership on this legislation.

It was unfortunate that this bill came up too late in the last session to receive the concurrence of the other body. With the overwhelmingly bipartisan support that has been given this approach by the House in years past, and again this year, it is to be hoped that the other body will see fit to give it its prompt endorsement.

Certainly the work of our State agricultural experiment stations has been among the most fruitful research which has contributed to the emergence of the American farmer as the most efficient and technically advanced in the world. It can do the same in the field of utilization research.

It is fitting that we continue to rely upon and strengthen the efforts of the existing experiment facilities in the historic pattern of State-Federal cooperative effort.

As sponsor of a similar measure, H.R. 7064, I urge passage of this measure to bring about much needed modernization and improvement of the physical facilities for research at State experiment stations. It will fill a basic need in my own agricultural State and across the Nation.

[Mr. HOEVEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.] \*

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this legislation. I think it is rather unique in the fact that although it does provide under this formula for a revised distribution, all of the experiment stations are in accord



with it. They feel it is a more equitable and desirable distribution of such moneys as are available. I am particularly interested and would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that this money which is to go for bricks and mortar or physical plant facilities is more necessary probably than it has been in the past. The reason is that many of our experimental stations and land grant colleges have available, particularly in the field of graduate study, fellowships and scholarships, which today they are unable to utilize properly because they do not have the facilities to use them. So this, in my opinion, is the right way, the best way, if we are going to assist in the field of higher education.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I think it is particularly significant that the legislation has a formula of distribution and that no funds will be paid any State except through actual performance under the act. In addition, it requires matching funds of equal amount at the State level, which permits the States to play an important part in the practical application and use of these funds.

(Mr. McINTIRE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in reading the bill H.R. 40 I notice there is nothing in it to identify any specific purpose of the research authorized. It directs itself toward expansion of facilities in the field of agricultural research. Those of us who are on the Committee on Agriculture can appreciate the need for agricultural research, but we think we must also recognize that there is a need for agricultural research in a certain field or a new field; namely, finding, if possible, new markets, new uses, and new crops.

In the Committee on Agriculture we deal continually with the simple fact that research has possibly been too successful and we are able to produce too much. As I read the bill, it seems to me there is no provision in the bill, no reference, no language that indicates the purpose of the bill is anything more than to expand our present type of agricultural research.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman makes a good point. It is a point that was considered by the subcommittee. We held hearings on this matter last year, and also 3 years ago, I believe. To attempt to limit the bill to specific and particular types of research meant that we would lose the benefit of additional research services of which the station may be capable. Reference was made to one particular point throughout the hearings. We put emphasis on it. We also made reference to it in the report. However, we felt that if we attempted to confine the stations to a particular type of research, it would be making a mistake.

Mr. SHORT. I agree that the use of these facilities should not be tied to any

particular purpose for an indefinite time in the future. I cannot help thinking, however, that in some way, somehow or other there should be identification of the direction we want agricultural research to go. As the gentleman knows, I am not a member of the subcommittee and I am not as knowledgeable perhaps as I should be about this bill—there is some language in the committee report that attempts to indicate that utilization of these additional facilities shall be directed in the field I have just mentioned.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All of the emphasis in the last 2 or 3 years on the part of our agricultural leaders in and out of Congress has been in that direction. I am quite sure that the agricultural scientists are familiar with that situation, and they themselves have been moving more in that direction than before.

Mr. SHORT. The only point I make is this: I would like to have the record on this bill, the committee report, and the record of debate here on the floor of the House indicate that we who are interested in agriculture are interested in emphasizing at this time this field of new utilization, new crops, new markets, and that sort of thing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I might say to the gentleman that actually that was the inspiration for this particular legislation. This grew out of an investigation made some years ago by a commission appointed by President Eisenhower. Two pieces of legislation came from that report. This is one. The other passed the House during the 86th Congress but failed to pass the other body.

Mr. SHORT. Being aware of this, as I read the bill, that is why I raised this point. The reason as the gentleman says, which inspired this legislation is not identified in the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman has made a good point, and I am glad he has made a record of such.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If I might have the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi, I would like to go one step further. If we are going to expand research facilities at the agricultural colleges of the country, let a substantial part of it be used to determine why the farmer is not paid a price commensurate with costs for what he produces rather than research for more production.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not disagree with the gentleman at all. I am 100 percent with the gentleman on that particular point.

Mr. GROSS. I notice in the morning paper that 2 dozen eggs can be bought in the District of Columbia, U.S. inspected, supposedly large eggs, for 77 cents. That is less than 40 cents a dozen at retail in the stores of the District of Columbia, one of the highest living cost areas of the country. Farmers must be getting less than 20 cents

a dozen for these eggs. No Iowa farmer could survive on that kind of a price.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I agree with the gentleman, as I usually do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to section 4 of the bill. Subsection (c) gives the power to the Secretary to prescribe rules and regulations in regard to the formula involved. It seems to me that earlier in this section the formula is very specifically set out, and I wonder what the meaning of this section might be and why this rulemaking power is necessary. I would direct a question to the gentleman from Mississippi, if he would be so kind as to answer, whether or not the rulemaking power of this section would, under any circumstances, give the Secretary the power to prescribe conditions, such as the type of construction or the particular kind of program involved.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There was evidence of a tremendous lack of facilities. The hearings developed that fact. I am not sure, but I think some reference was made in the report to that effect. Each State under the bill will submit its program to the Department. The Secretary was given this power in order that he could specifically eliminate the overlapping of research. Then there is a certain amount of housekeeping incidental to the program. There will be forms upon which applications will be made. There will be forms upon which programs will be submitted. Each State will be called upon to submit its program to the Department. So, we just thought the rulesmaking section was essential. The Secretary did not write this bill. He had nothing to do with it. This bill was submitted to the members of our committee by the people who operate this program back in the States. The bill was never seen in the Department of Agriculture until long after it was submitted to us. So there was no effort on the part of the Secretary to grab up any special power.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand, then, from the gentleman's remarks it is intended by the committee and the language of this bill that the Secretary shall have power to decide what particular program the State agricultural institutions are carrying on. He can determine whether they are duplicating or not and whether it is wise or not. This implies that he can control all the work being done by the individual States under the program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not think he could control it any more than he controls it at this time. But certainly someone in the Department should review and evaluate, if not approve, the projects and programs.

Both the State and the Federal Government have an equal voice in this program. There is nothing incumbent on the part of any State to participate in the program. They can get in or stay out, just as they choose.



Mr. TAFT. Would I be correct in the opinion that if a State accepts the money that under this provision the Secretary can prescribe rules and regulations?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Not after they have accepted it.

Mr. TAFT. Which must be complied with in order to participate in the program?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, sir; not after they have accepted it, but before, and there must be a meeting of the minds as to the kind, type, and character of the research to be carried on.

Mr. TAFT. This does not amount to control, then?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would say that one has no more control than the other. It is a matter of mutual question of the effort and understanding.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 40 is a bill which has considerable merit except for the fact that it appears to delegate to the Secretary of Agriculture the right, duty, and responsibility to administer this act and to disburse any funds which may hereinafter be appropriated as he may deem necessary and proper pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, subject to the limitation of section 4. I would be strongly inclined to support this legislation if anyone here on the floor could or would assure me that the operation of this act would be such as to allow the Congress or some appropriate committee thereof, to determine the projects which are to be built and developed. Agricultural research is very important to the economy of our country but to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to have the authority to, in effect, distribute whatever funds may be appropriated pursuant to this legislation is not only improper but is in effect making a political football out of this legislation which should be a vital, nonpartisan operation.

My own State of Kentucky has a National Tobacco Research Center. During 1960 and 1961 the General Assembly of Kentucky appropriated \$1 million for an agricultural science center and for tobacco research at such center. Subsequently the Governor made available an additional \$1 million for construction and research at such center. Thereafter, in 1962, there was appropriated and allocated by the general assembly more than \$2 million for construction and research at this center. Since 1960 the Congress has appropriated more than \$200,000 each year to the Agricultural Research Service for tobacco research, a large portion of which has been allocated to the agricultural research center of the University of Kentucky for this project.

Kentucky has led the way and pointed out that the States can and will do for themselves. It appears to me that under this legislation that Kentucky could well be penalized for its hard work and initiative in appropriating some \$4 million for this tobacco research center out of its own funds. It could well be that the Secretary of Agriculture will determine another research center as the proper forum for research in the tobacco industry and make available Federal

funds, some of which will come from Kentucky, on a matching-funds basis to another research center and thereby bypass the usual and customary procedure of a specific authorization for a specific project because I have been given to understand that appropriations for H.R. 40 will be in the nature of a package appropriation and not specifically designated for any specific projects.

I cannot conscientiously support H.R. 40 in its present form. I will shortly find myself among a very few who will vote against this proposed bill and I would like to vote for it—and would vote for it—if the authority for the selection of the projects rested with the Congress or if the Congress would include in the legislation guidelines whereby the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to follow certain criteria and if the appropriations authorized by this bill would be in a sum certain rather than in an unknown amount. I am advised on the floor today that this bill will involve \$12 million which is unbudgeted for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the cooperative efforts of the Agriculture Department with the various State agriculture experiment stations has aided immeasurably in the tremendous progress which has helped make American agriculture the most efficient in the world. This is one program of the Federal Government that can show some good and positive results.

However, insofar as this bill (H.R. 40) is concerned, I question provisions set forth in this bill that would turn even more power and control of this program over to the Secretary of Agriculture and further, authorize limitless sums as deemed necessary for the administration of this act.

This Nation and our people are not in a good enough financial condition that we can continue to expand existing programs and provide no limit on the spending and funding of such programs.

On page 3, line 16, the bill states:

It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secretary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this act under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as necessary therefor.

On page 6, line 12, of this bill is stated:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of this act.

While I can, in the reason of continued agricultural progress, support the good and sound advances brought about by previous related programs, I find it difficult indeed to support a bill that provides such limitless control and cost as H.R. 40 authorizes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 40.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 274, nays 30, not voting 129, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—274

Abbott	Hanna	Pike
Abernethy	Hansen	Pilcher
Adair	Harding	Pirnie
Albert	Hardy	Poage
Andrews	Harris	Poff
Arends	Harrison	Powell
Ashbrook	Harsha	Price
Ashley	Harvey, Ind.	Pucinski
Ashmore	Harvey, Mich.	Quile
Avery	Hays	Randall
Baker	Hechler	Reld, N.Y.
Baldwin	Henderson	Reifel
Barling	Herlong	Reuss
Barry	Hoeven	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bass	Hollfield	Rich
Battin	Holland	Riehlman
Beckworth	Horan	Rivers, Alaska
Bennett, Fla.	Horton	Rivers, S.C.
Betts	Huddleston	Roberts, Tex.
Blatnik	Ichord	Robison
Boland	Jensen	Rogers, Colo.
Bolton	Joelson	Rogers, Fla.
Oliver P.	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Johnson, Wis.	Rooney
Bow	Jonas	Roudebush
Bray	Jones, Ala.	Roybal
Brock	Jones, Mo.	Ryan, Mich.
Brooks	Karsten	Ryan, N.Y.
Broomfield	Karsh	Schadeberg
Brotzman	Kastenmeyer	Schenck
Brown, Calif.	Kelly	Schneebell
Brown, Ohio	Keogh	Schweiker
Broyhill, N.C.	Kilburn	Schwengel
Bruce	Kilgore	Secrest
Burke	Kling, Calif.	Selden
Burkhalter	Kirwan	Senner
Burleson	Knox	ShIPLEY
Byrnes, Wls.	Kunkel	Short
Cameron	Kyl	Sickles
Cannon	Laird	Sikes
Casey	Landrum	Siler
Cederberg	Langen	Sisk
Chenoweth	Lankford	Skubitz
Clark	Latta	Slack
Clausen	Leggett	Smith, Va.
Cleveland	Lennon	Springer
Cohelan	Libonati	Staeble
Colmer	Lindsay	Stafford
Corman	Long, Md.	Stephens
Cunningham	McCulloch	Stubblefield
Curtin	McDade	Sullivan
Daddario	McDowell	Talcott
Dague	McFall	Taylor
Daniels	McIntire	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	McLoskey	Teague, Tex.
Denton	McMillan	Thomas
Derwinski	MacGregor	Thompson, La.
Dingell	Mahon	Thompson, Tex.
Dole	Marsh	Thomson, Wis.
Dorn	Martin, Nebr.	Thornberry
Dowdy	Mathias	Toll
Duncan	Matsunaga	Tollefson
Dwyer	Matthews	Trimble
Edmondson	May	Tuck
Edwards	Meador	Tupper
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	Tuten
Everett	Milliken	Udall
Evins	Mills	Ullman
Fallon	Montoya	Van Deerlin
Fascell	Moore	Vanik
Feighan	Morgan	Van Pelt
Findley	Morris	Waggonner
Flood	Morse	Wallhauser
Flynt	Mosher	Weaver
Fraser	Moss	Weltner
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Ill.	Westland
Fulton, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Wharton
Fulton, Tenn.	Murray	White
Fuqua	Natcher	Whitener
Gathings	Nelsen	Whitten
Gavin	Norblad	Wickersham
Gill	Nygard	Widnall
Glenn	O'Brien, Ill.	Williams
Gonzalez	O'Brien, N.Y.	Willis
Green, Oreg.	O'Hara, Ill.	Wilson, Bob
Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Mich.	Wilson,
Griffin	Olson, Minn.	Charles H.
Griffiths	Ostertag	Wilson, Ind.
Gubser	Passman	Winstead
Gurney	Patman	Wright
Hagen, Calif.	Pelly	Young
Haley	Perkins	Zablocki



## NAYS—30

Abele	Gross	Minshall
Bates	Hall	Pillion
Becker	Hosmer	Pooi
Bell	Hutchinson	Rumsfeld
Broyhill, Va.	Johansen	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	King, N.Y.	Snyder
Curtis	Lipscomb	Stinson
Devine	McClory	Taft
Foreman	Maillard	Wylder
Goodell	Martin, Calif.	Younger

## NOT VOTING—129

Addabbo	Fogarty	Multer
Alger	Ford	Nedzi
Anderson	Forrester	Nix
Aspinall	Fountain	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Friedel	Olsen, Mont.
Ayres	Gallagher	O'Neill
Barrett	Garmatz	Osmer
Beermann	Gary	Patten
Belcher	Glaimo	Pepper
Bennett, Mich.	Gibbons	Philbin
Berry	Gilbert	Purcell
Boggs	Goodling	Quillen
Bolling	Grabowski	Rains
Bolton,	Grant	Reid, Ill.
Frances P.	Gray	Rhodes, Pa.
Brademas	Grover	Roberts, Ala.
Bromwell	Hagan, Ga.	Rodino
Buckley	Halleck	Roosevelt
Burton	Halpern	Rosenthal
Byrne, Pa.	Hawkins	Rostenkowski
Cahill	Healey	Roush
Carey	Hébert	St. George
Celler	Hemphill	St. Germain
Chamberlain	Hoffman	St. Onge
Chelf	Hull	Saylor
Collier	Jarman	Scott
Conte	Jennings	Shelley
Cooley	Kee	Sheppard
Corbett	Kelth	Shriver
Cramer	Kluczynski	Sibal
Davis, Tenn.	Kornegay	Smith, Iowa
Dawson	Lesinski	Staggers
Delaney	Lloyd	Steed
Dent	Long, La.	Stratton
Derounian	Macdonald	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Madden	Utt
Donohue	Martin, Mass.	Vinson
Downing	Michel	Walter
Dulski	Miller, N.Y.	Watson
Elliot	Minish	Watts
Farbstein	Monagan	Whalley
Finnegan	Moorhead	Wyman
Fino	Morrison	
Fisher	Morton	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Auchincloss and Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Alger against.

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. St. Onge and Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Anderson.  
Mr. Multer with Mr. Miller of New York.  
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Hoffman.  
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bromwell.  
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Conte.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Goodling.  
Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.  
Mr. Gary with Mr. Fino.  
Mr. Carey with Mr. Shriver.  
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Michel.  
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Collier.  
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Corbett.  
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. O'Konski.  
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Morton.  
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Chamberlain.  
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Ford.  
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Belcher.  
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Floyd.  
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Burton.  
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Sibai.  
Mr. Donohue with Mrs. St. George.  
Mr. Rains with Mr. Quillen.  
Mr. Glaimo with Mr. Keith.  
Mr. Hagan of Georgia, with Mr. Berry.  
Mr. Gray with Mr. Grover.  
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Osmer.  
Mr. Hull with Mr. Saylor.  
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wyman.  
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Beermann.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ayres.

## GENERAL PAIRS

Mr. Steed with Mr. Roosevelt.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Rostenkowski.  
Mr. Stratton with Mr. St. Germain.  
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Gallagher.  
Mr. Minish with Mrs. Kee.  
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Watts.  
Mr. Nix with Mr. Long of Louisiana.  
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Madden.  
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Chelf.  
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Macdonald.  
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Nedzi.  
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Olsen.  
Mr. Downing with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Roush.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Dawson.  
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Pepper.  
Mr. Scott with Mr. Patman.  
Mr. Healey with Mr. Grant.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE CIVIL SERVICE

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, 80 years ago when the civil service law was first passed, and called the Pendleton Act, there were very few thousand employees under the act. Today there are more than 2½ million. And so it is necessary that we have representative organizations of the many groups that make up the Federal employment.

Last year there was organized a new organization, the Federal Professional Association, which is recognized, and its purpose is to organize professional employees and to aid them in appearing before the Congress and the many administrative departments of the Government concerning these employees.

I make available to my colleagues in the following statement the aspirations of this organization:

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE FOUNDING CONFERENCE, THE FEDERAL PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 28, 1962, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM, CONSTITUTION AVENUE BETWEEN 12TH AND 14TH STREETS N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Federal Professional Association is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization engaged in research, education, and representation to enhance the value of the Federal career services to the Nation; foster high standards of professional work in the Government; and generally promote the welfare of professional personnel in the Government.

THE FEDERAL PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION, Washington, D.C.

## FOUNDING COMMITTEE

Vincent J. Brown, Ph. D., political science, Howard University.

Charles E. Burkhead, statistics, Department of Agriculture.

Roy W. Crawley, Ph. D., psychology, public administration, Agency for International Development.

Leonard T. Crook, P.E., civil engineering, Army Engineers.

Albert M. Dickson, economics, Department of Agriculture (retired).

Herbert P. Dunning, Public Health Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

W. Brooke Graves, Ph. D., American Government, Public Administration, Library of Congress.

Gregory K. Hartmann, Ph. D., Research and Development Management, Naval Ordnance Laboratory.

Vincent E. Jay, management analysis, General Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Lewis P. McCann, Ph. D., cytogenetics, Science Administration, Department of Agriculture.

Lionel V. Murphy, personnel administration, Brookings Institution.

Emmett Sheehan, Jr., law, labor relations, National Labor Relations Board.

Harold A. Stone, P.E., management engineering, Department of the Army.

Denver W. Warnock, general administration, District of Columbia government.

C. Packard Wolle, Ph. D., administration and management, Federal Aviation Agency.

The founding conference met at 9:30 a.m., pursuant to notice provided for in article X, section 1002 of the constitution. Dr. Gregory K. Hartmann, chairman of the program committee, presiding. Dr. Hartmann introduced the Honorable Robert Ramspeck, as master of ceremonies.

Mr. Ramspeck, now retired, has been a Congressman from Georgia for over 30 years, and has also served as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He is known and respected by literally millions of employees of the Federal Government. It is indeed fitting that he should preside over this first public meeting of the Federal Professional Association. Mr. Ramspeck.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I should like to read some communications which have been received.

(Mr. Ramspeck read letters of best wishes from Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York; Mr. Rocco C. Siciliano, formerly an assistant to President Eisenhower; Mr. Clarence B. Randall, who has been in and out of government for many years and who is well-known in the field of business; the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, an executive of the Eastman Kodak Co. for many years; and a telegram from a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Services Committee, Senator FRANK CARLSON.)

Mr. RAMSPECK (continuing). It is my hope that as the years pass we will celebrate the founding of the Federal Professional Association as a landmark in the progress of better government, just as we will mark the 80th anniversary of the Civil Service Act next month.

When the Civil Service Act was passed almost 80 years ago, we had a Federal Government small in numbers and very limited in its activities. That is no longer true. Today we find our Government greatly expanded in numbers and even more in the scope of its activities. Whether we like it or not, the hope of the free peoples of the world depends upon the success or failure of the activities of the United States.

The citizens of our country will not hold our public servants in high esteem unless they know what is being done and understand the results being obtained.

Recently when I was in a meeting with Congressman MAHON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Defense Department, he pointed out that today we are trying to run the United States, the







88TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 40

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 8, 1963

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

---

## AN ACT

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research  
at the State agricultural experiment stations.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to  
4       continue its support of agricultural research at the State  
5       agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds,  
6       on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as  
7       required for the effective conduct of an adequate research  
8       program.

9       SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to assist the State  
10       agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisi-  
11       tion, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other

1 capital facilities (including the acquisition of fixtures and  
2 equipment which are to become a part of such buildings)  
3 which are necessary to more effectively conduct research in  
4 agriculture and sciences related thereto through means of  
5 grants from the Federal Government.

6 SEC. 3. As used in sections 2 to 11, inclusive, of this  
7 Act—

8 (1) the term “State” shall include Puerto Rico;

9 (2) the term “State agricultural experiment sta-  
10 tion” means a department established under the direc-  
11 tion of a college or university in any State in accord-  
12 ance with the Act entitled “An Act donating public  
13 lands to the several States and Territories which may  
14 provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and me-  
15 chanic arts”, approved July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301);  
16 or a department otherwise established pursuant to  
17 standards prescribed by the State the purpose of which  
18 is to conduct agricultural research; and

19 (3) the term “Secretary” shall mean the Secre-  
20 tary of Agriculture.

21 SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appro-  
22 priated for allocation to the States for the purposes of sec-  
23 tion 2 such sums as the Congress deems advisable.

1 (b) (1) One-third of the funds appropriated pursuant  
2 to this section for any fiscal year shall be allotted equally  
3 among the States.

4 (2) Two-thirds of the funds appropriated pursuant to  
5 this section for any fiscal year shall be allocated among the  
6 States as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the  
7 same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural  
8 population of the State bears to the total rural population of  
9 all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial  
10 census current at the time each such sum is first appropri-  
11 ated; and one-half in an amount which bears the same ratio  
12 to the total amount to be allotted as the farm population of  
13 the State bears to the total farm population of all the States  
14 as determined by the last preceding decennial census current  
15 at the time such sum is first appropriated.

16 (c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secre-  
17 tary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this Act  
18 under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as  
19 necessary therefor.

20 SEC. 5. Any State in order to be eligible for payments  
21 from funds allocated pursuant to section 4 shall submit, in  
22 such form as the Secretary may require, specific proposals  
23 for acquisition or construction of physical facilities defined in



1 section 2 of this Act. No State shall receive any payment  
2 for any such proposal unless such proposal is approved by  
3 the Secretary.

4 SEC. 6. (a) No payment shall be made to any State  
5 under the provisions of section 4 of this Act in any amount  
6 greater than the amount made available by such State  
7 from non-Federal funds for purposes for which payments  
8 are made under section 4 of this Act.

9 (b) Any unused portion of the allotment of any State  
10 for any fiscal year shall remain available, at the option of  
11 such State, for payment to such State for a period of not  
12 more than two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which  
13 such allotment is first made available.

14 SEC. 7. With respect to multiple-purpose physical facili-  
15 ties, the segment or portion thereof which is to be utilized for  
16 agricultural research shall be the basis for determination of  
17 fund support under this Act.

18 SEC. 8. For each fiscal year that funds are made avail-  
19 able for allocation to States under the provisions of section 4  
20 and section 6 of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain, at  
21 the earliest practicable date during such year, the amount  
22 of the allocation to which each State is entitled, and shall  
23 notify each State in writing promptly thereafter as to the  
24 amount of such allocation.

25 SEC. 9. (a) Any State agricultural experiment station

1 authorized to receive payments under the provisions of  
2 section 4 of this Act shall have a chief administrative officer,  
3 to be known as a director, and a treasurer or other officer  
4 appointed by the governing board of such station. Such  
5 treasurer or other officer shall receive and account for all  
6 funds paid to such station pursuant to the provisions of this  
7 Act, and shall submit a report, approved by the director of  
8 such station, to the Secretary on or before the first day of  
9 September of each year. Such report shall contain a de-  
10 tailed statement of the amount received under the provisions  
11 of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its dis-  
12 bursements on schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

13 (b) If any portion of the allotted funds received by the  
14 authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experi-  
15 ment station shall by any action or contingency be dimin-  
16 ished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be repaid by the State  
17 concerned, and until repaid no part of any subsequent appro-  
18 priation shall be allocated or paid to such State.

19 SEC. 10. The Secretary shall make an annual report to  
20 the Congress during the first regular session of each year  
21 with respect to (1) payments made under this Act, (2)  
22 the facilities, by States, for which such payments were made,  
23 and (3) whether any portion of the appropriation available  
24 for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the  
25 reasons therefor.

1        SEC. 11. (a) Any agricultural experiment station estab-  
2        lished by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this  
3        Act.

4        (b) With respect to any State in which more than one  
5        agricultural experiment station has been established, any  
6        appropriations allocated for the use of such State pursuant  
7        to the provisions of this Act shall be divided between or  
8        among such institutions as the legislature of such State shall  
9        direct.

10       SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated  
11       such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of  
12       this Act.

Passed the House of Representatives May 6, 1963.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*





---

---

AN ACT

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

---

---

MAY 8, 1963

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued June 20, 1963  
For actions of June 19, 1963  
88th-1st; No. 92

## CONTENTS

Alaska land.....2  
Area  
  redevelopment.....16,19,39  
Civil rights.....1,22,36  
Consumers.....28  
Cotton.....29  
Dairy industry.....15,31  
Data processing.....24  
Drugs.....28  
Electrification.....8,33  
Employment.....1,25

Export-Import Bank.....5  
Farm labor.....18,30  
Feed.....2  
Food.....14  
Foreign aid.....12  
Foreign trade.....23  
Forestry.....2,35  
Highways.....27  
Lands.....2,7,26  
Legislative program.....16  
Loans.....1,12

Lumber.....6  
Manpower.....1,32  
Packers and Stockyards.4  
Parks.....37  
Peanuts.....2  
Poultry.....12  
Property.....9  
Public works.....20  
Recreation.....7  
Research.....2  
Subsidies.....34  
Sugar.....13  
Tariff.....6  
Tobacco.....2  
USDA omnibus bill.....11  
Vocational education...1  
Water resources.10,21,38  
Watersheds.....3,21  
Wheat.....17  
Wildlife.....35  
Youth employment.....1

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses received President's civil rights message. Senate committee voted to report bills re experiment stations research facilities, agricultural land development Alaska, penalties on misuse of feed in disaster areas, transfer of tobacco allotments, and allotment exemption for green peanuts. Senate committee reported Packers and Stockyards bill re deductions for promotion and research activities. Sen. Williams (Del.) criticized Common Market import duties on poultry.

## SENATE

1. CIVIL RIGHTS. Both Houses received the President's message on civil rights (H. Doc. 124)(pp. 10533-9, 10552-7). The message includes proposals for additional funds to broaden the Manpower Development and Training Program, additional funds to finance the pending Youth Employment bill, expansion of the vocational education program, permanent extension of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, and enactment of legislation to make it clear that the Federal Government is not required, under any statute, to furnish any kind of financial assistance, by way of grant, loan, contract, guaranty, insurance, or otherwise, to any program or activity in which racial discrimination occurs.

Several Senators debated the merits of the President's civil rights proposals. pp. 10473-4, 10475, 10476-8, 10485-6, 10511, 10513-4, 10539-49

2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE voted to report (but did not actually report) the following bills: H. R. 40, to authorize additional funds for construction of research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations, S. 623, to provide for a program of agricultural land development in Alaska, S. 581, with amendment, to extend provisions of law for the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments, S. 400, to provide uniform penalties for misuse of feed made available in disaster areas, S. 582, to continue the exemption of green peanuts from acreage allotments and quotas, S. 1388, to add certain lands to Cache National Forest, Utah, and S. 51, to authorize relinquishment to Wyo. of the jurisdiction over the Pole Mountain District of Medicine Bow National Forest. p. D452
3. WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved the following watershed projects: Buckhorn-Mesa, Ariz., Tupelo Bayou, Ark., Naaluhu, Hawaii, Bear-Pierce-Cedar, Nebr., Bellwood, Nebr., Caney Creek, Okla., and Thompson Creek, Tenn. (supplemental plan). p. D452
4. PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5860, to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act so as to provide that the authority of the Secretary shall not apply to deductions from the sales proceeds for financing promotion or research activities relating to livestock, meats, and other products covered by the Act (S. Rept. 280). p. 10460
5. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment H. R. 3872, to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington (S. Rept. 262). pp. 10459-60
6. LUMBER; TARIFF. The Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 1032, to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act of 1916 (S. Rept. 261). p. 10460
7. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 535, to extend the principles of equitable adjudication to sales of land under the Alaska Public Sale Act (S. Rept. 264). p. 10460  
The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. J. Res. 17, to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, and the recreation area contiguous to such lake in Wyo. and Utah, as "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area" (S. Rept. 279). p. 10460
8. ELECTRIFICATION. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 180, to authorize continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park for a hydroelectric project. This measure will now be sent to the President. p. 10525
9. PROPERTY. Passed as reported S. 1326, to provide for the conveyance by the Department of the Interior of certain mineral interests of the U. S. in property in S. C. to the record owners of the surface of the property (relates to mineral interests transferred from the Farmers Home Administration to the Department of the Interior). pp. 10529-31
10. WATER RESOURCES. Passed as reported S. 614, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make water available for a permanent pool for recreation purposes at Cochita Reservoir from the San Juan-Chama unit of the Colorado River storage project. pp. 10523-4









# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued June 21, 1963  
For actions of June 20, 1963  
88th-1st, No. 93

## CONTENTS

Adjournment.....13,24	Education.....21	Food for peace.....5
Appropriations....14,23,28	Experiment stations.....1	Foreign aid.....11,27,36
Area redevelopment.....12	Export-Import Bank.....12	Foreign trade.....18
Assistant Secretary.....19	Farm labor.....6,15	Forestry.....1
Atomic energy.....10	Farm program.....31	Grants-in-aid.....33
Civil rights.....29	Feed.....1	Information.....7
Conservation.....30	Fish flour.....25	Land development.....1
Domestic peace corps.....9	Fisheries.....34	Lands.....1,3
		Legislative program..12,23
		Nominations.....10
		Personnel.....22,32
		Postage.....20,23
		Property.....35
		Research.....1,17
		Retirement.....32
		Taxation.....2,12
		Tobacco.....8
		Transportation.....4
		Water resources.....16,23
		Wheat.....26

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported bills re experiment stations research facilities, agricultural land development in Alaska, penalties on misuse of feed in disaster areas, transfer of tobacco allotments, and exemption of green peanuts from allotments. Sen. Humphrey commended passage of migratory farm labor bills. Sen. Long (Mo.) urged expanded food for peace program. Reps. Fountain and Dwyer introduced and discussed bills to provide review of Federal grants-in-aid.

## SENATE

1. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE reported the following bills: p. 10623  
H R. 40, without amendment, to authorize the appropriation of Federal funds, on a matching basis, specifically for the purpose of assisting in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other physical facilities for agricultural research in State agricultural experiment stations (S. Rept. 288).  
S. 623, without amendment, to authorize this Department to institute a program of agricultural land development in Alaska (S. Rept. 287).  
S. 400, without amendment, to establish penalties for misuse of feed made available by this Department for relieving distress or preservation and maintenance of foundation herds (S. Rept. 284).  
S. 581, with amendment, to extend present provisions of law permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments (S. Rept. 286).  
S. 582, without amendment, to extend for two years the present exemption of green peanuts from allotments and quotas (S. Rept. 285).

S. 1388, without amendment, to provide for the addition of lands to the Cache National Forest, Utah (S. Rept. 283).

S. 51, without amendment, to authorize this Department to relinquish to Wyo. jurisdiction over those lands within the Medicine Bow National Forest known as the Pole Mountain District (S. Rept. 282).

2. TAXATION. The Finance Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6755, to continue for one year (until July 1, 1964) the present combined 52 percent corporate income tax rate and the present rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service, and transportation of persons by air (S. Rept. 281). p. 10623
3. LANDS. Passed as reported S. J. Res. 17, to designate the lake to be formed by waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, as "Lake O'Mahoney." p. 10670
4. TRANSPORTATION. Began debate on S. 684, to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission may approve the application of a freight forwarder if the Commission finds that the transaction proposed will enable the applicant to use the service of the motor carrier or freight forwarder to public advantage in its operations, will be consistent with the public interest, and will not unduly restrain competition. pp. 10653-62  
Sen. Miller submitted amendments intended to be proposed to this bill, S. 684. p. 10633
5. FOOD FOR PEACE. Sen. Long (Mo.) commended and urged expansion of the food for peace program, stated that the present program "only scratches the surface of the problem," and inserted an editorial in support of his views. p. 10652
6. FARM LABOR. Sen. Humphrey commended recent Senate passage of several bills to provide aid to migratory farm workers and inserted two items commending Sen. Williams (N.J.) for his efforts in the passage of this legislation. pp. 10634-5
7. INFORMATION. Sen. Humphrey commended the establishment of an Advisory Council on the Arts by the President as "a historic step forward in building a more productive and enlightened relationship between the Federal Government and the artistic and cultural life of this country." pp. 10643-6
8. TOBACCO. Sen. Neuberger expressed concern over the possible harmful effects of cigarette smoking and stated that she intended to introduce legislation soon to ban distribution of free cigarette samples to minors, restrict the permissible tar and nicotine yields from cigarettes, and provide for a moderate increase in cigarette taxes. pp. 10637-9
9. DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS. Sen. Kennedy inserted an editorial supporting enactment of legislation to provide for the establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps. pp. 10646-7
10. NOMINATIONS. The Jt. Committee on Atomic Energy reported the nominations of Glenn T. Seaborg and Gerald F. Tape to be members of the Atomic Energy Commission. p. 10643
11. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Keating submitted amendments intended to be proposed to the foreign aid authorization bill "to insure that U. S. funds are not used to subsidize aggressive military ventures and purchases of Soviet military equipment on the part of aid recipients." pp. 10633-4



## EXPERIMENT STATION RESEARCH FACILITIES

---

JUNE 20, 1963.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

## R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 40]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 40), to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill is identical to S. 1070 which was introduced by Senators Eastland, Stennis, Aiken, and Young of North Dakota.

## SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill provides for the appropriation of funds to be apportioned among the States for the construction of research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations. Use of Hatch Act funds for such construction is now authorized by section 4 of that act; but only very limited use of such authority has been made, partly because such funds are available only on an annual basis and States have been unable to accumulate sufficient funds for major capital outlays. Grants under the bill would be available for 3 years.

Grant funds would be apportioned under the act to the States—

- (1) One-third equally among the States;
- (2) One-third on the basis of rural population; and
- (3) One-third on the basis of farm population.

All Federal grants would have to be matched by at least equal sums from non-Federal sources.

## HEARINGS

In 1962 hearings were held on H.R. 12712, which is identical to H.R. 40, by the subcommittee in charge of this legislation. Favorable testimony was presented on behalf of the Department of Agri-

culture and the experiment station section of the legislative committee of the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. There was no opposition to the bill.

CONSIDERATION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND  
DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Attached are excerpts from the report of the House Committee on Agriculture (H. Rept. 271, 88th Cong.) further discussing the need for this legislation.

NEED

A very substantial part of the tremendous progress which has, in the past few decades, made American agriculture the most efficient in the world, is due to the research work which has been carried out jointly by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the various States in the State agricultural experiment stations. Since 1887, when the Hatch Act was enacted, this work has been carried out cooperatively between the States and the Federal Government, with State funds at least matching the funds made available by the Federal Government. A very large part of the Department's agricultural research is conducted in these State experiment stations.

Since this cooperative research program has been in operation for more than 70 years, and most of the experiment stations were established early in the program, many of the buildings, laboratories, and other facilities are far from modern. Many of them, constructed primarily for research in agricultural production, are not suitable for research in the utilization of agricultural commodities, for the basic research increasingly necessary to develop new uses, nor for employment of the advanced techniques, equipment, and methods which have become available in recent years.

In 1955, Congress recognized the urgent need to improve and modernize the physical facilities of the State experiment stations and amended the Hatch Act (7 U.S.C. 361d) to authorize the use of funds appropriated thereunder "for the purchase and rental of land and the construction, acquisition, alteration, or repair of buildings necessary for conducting research."

For several reasons this authority has not been used. Traditionally, Hatch Act funds have been used almost exclusively for research operations and not for facilities. There is no requirement in the existing law of approval of facility construction in advance by the Secretary in order to avoid duplication or unnecessary expenditures. There is no authority in the existing law for funds allotted to a State to be carried over from one fiscal year to another, making construction of a major facility with matching funds virtually impossible. For these reasons, among others, the Department of Agriculture has not requested nor has the Congress appropriated any funds specifically for the purpose of research facility construction and improvement, although Congress has clearly recognized the need for such a program.

This bill will provide the specific authorization and guidelines for cooperative Federal-State action in bringing about much needed modernization and improvement of the physical facilities for research at the State experiment stations.



## SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

*Policy.*—Section 1 is the declaration of congressional policy to support agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations by assisting, on a fund-matching basis, the construction and acquisition of physical facilities.

*Purpose.*—Section 2 states that the purpose of the act is to assist the State agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other capital facilities necessary to the more effective research in agriculture and related sciences. It makes it clear that funds appropriated hereunder may be spent for fixtures and equipment only when these will be a part of the buildings in which they are housed.

*Definition.*—Section 3 includes Puerto Rico in the definition of "State" and defines State agricultural experiment stations as a department established pursuant to the act of July 2, 1862, providing for the establishment of the land-grant colleges. This definition is modified, however, by section 11 of the bill which makes it clear that any agricultural experiment station established by State law, whether on the campus of a land-grant college or not, is to be eligible for benefits under this act.

*Appropriation: allocation.*—Section 4 authorizes appropriations for the purposes of section 2 of the bill and provides for allocation of such funds as may be appropriated on the following basis: One-third to be allotted equally among the States; one-third to be allocated on the basis of the rural population of the States; and one-third to be allocated on the basis of the farm population of the States. It is to be noted that this is an allocation only and that no funds will actually be paid to any State except under performance under the act.

*Eligibility.*—Section 5 provides that before any State is eligible for payment of any part of the funds allotted to it, it must submit, pursuant to regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture, specific proposals for the acquisition of construction of the physical facilities to be added to the experiment station and that funds will be available to the States hereunder only when such specific proposal is approved by the Secretary.

*Matching.*—Section 6 provides that Federal funds must be at least matched by State funds and that funds allocated to a State may, at its option, be carried over for not to exceed 2 fiscal years before they are actually used. This will permit a State to plan a major structure as part of its facilities program and use the Federal allocation available to it in 3 consecutive fiscal years in connection with the construction of such a structure.

*Multiple-purpose facilities.*—Section 7 makes it clear that where a multiple-purpose structure is proposed, such as one which will include both classrooms and laboratory facilities, only that part of the structure which is actually to be used for agricultural research will be eligible for Federal assistance under this act.

*Notification.*—Section 8 provides that the Secretary shall allocate to the States, pursuant to the formula set out in section 4, any appropriations which are made to carry out the purposes of this act and shall notify each State, as soon as practicable, the amount of its allocation.

*Fiscal accountability.*—Section 9 provides that each experiment station authorized to receive payments under this act shall have a

treasurer or other officer appointed by the governing board of the station who will receive and account for all funds paid to the station pursuant to the provisions of this act. That official is also required to submit a report to the Secretary of Agriculture on or before the first day of September of each year containing, on schedules prescribed by the Secretary, a detailed statement of the amount received pursuant to this act during the preceding fiscal year and disbursements thereof. The section also provides that if any portion of the allotted funds received by the authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experiment station shall be diminished, lost, or misapplied, it must be repaid to the Federal Government by the State concerned and until it is repaid no part of any subsequent appropriation may be allocated or paid to such State.

*Report to Congress.*—Section 10 requires the Secretary to make an annual report to Congress showing payments made under the act, the facilities by States for which such payments were made, and any allotment which has been withheld from any State and the reason therefor.

*Off-campus experiment stations.*—Section 11 provides that any agricultural experiment station established by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this act and that in a State having more than one eligible experiment station, the division of the Federal allocation between such stations shall be made by the legislature of that State.

*Administration.*—Section 12 authorizes appropriations for the administration of this act.

#### DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

Attached is the report of the Department of Agriculture on S. 1070, an identical bill, favoring enactment of this legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1963.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 15, 1963, giving us the opportunity to report on S. 1070. The bill is entitled "To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations."

This bill would continue the support of agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds on a matching basis to help finance physical facilities needed for the conduct of an adequate research program. Sums appropriated for such purposes would be allocated—(1) one-third equally to each State; (2) two-thirds on the basis of—(a) one-half on ratio of rural population of a State to the total rural population of all States; and (b) one-half on ratio of farm population of a State to the total farm population of all States, with provisions for accumulating formula funds for up to 3 years. It provides authority to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration, including limitations, accountability, and reporting requirements to the Congress.

S. 1070 would amend, clarify, and strengthen an authorization of long standing. A general authority for the construction of facilities



for agricultural research at State agricultural experiment stations is provided under 7 U.S.C. 361d. However, sums appropriated for payments to State agricultural experiment stations have been used primarily by these stations for the conduct of research. The limited use of such grant funds for facilities has been due in part to the inability of the individual States to accumulate sufficient funds for major capital outlays even with matching State funds. This bill would, therefore, provide a workable mechanism and an amplification of the existing authorization whereby funds appropriated through annual appropriations would enable the States to plan needed facilities in support of an agricultural research program. The bill also provides for a sound formula for the distribution of allotments to the various States for construction of such facilities. The States in turn would match Federal funds. There is no commitment on the part of the Federal Government or individual States for the appropriation of any definite amounts.

In recent years, the need for adequate physical facilities for the conduct of agricultural research has been recognized by both the States and the Federal Government. Many of the research programs of the State agricultural experiment stations and those of the Federal Government are a joint cooperative enterprise and there is a close working relationship. We cooperate formally on more than half of our research and informally on most of the rest. This Federal-State cooperative system is largely responsible for the outstanding progress that has been made in agricultural research during the past 75 years.

This Department favors the enactment of S. 1070. This proposed legislation would provide an orderly procedure for the development and planning of long-range physical facilities needed in connection with the joint Federal-State agricultural research program. Funds to carry out the purposes of this bill would come within the annual budget process.

The Department independently and in cooperation with other agencies conducts basic research and the applied research involved in the solution of national and regional problems. The State stations also conduct basic research and applied research on problems of local and regional significance. These two programs are closely interrelated. Experience shows that the Federal Department of Agriculture and State experiment stations work efficiently together. Accordingly, whatever further obligations may be placed on agricultural research are in large measure obligations upon the entire research structure, Federal and State. We recognize that the States have both immediate and future needs for research facilities. The Department of Agriculture has similar needs. We believe these needs should be met as rapidly as can be done.

We have about 2,300 Federal employees working on college campuses and State-owned field stations and spend approximately \$20 million at these locations. Pressure on available facilities is making it increasingly difficult to maintain current the program and places severe limitation on orderly expansion and development.

Under authority of section 4(c), it is expected that the Department would issue a regulation (1) requiring recipients to maintain such records as would facilitate effective audit and (2) providing for access



for the purpose of audit and examination to books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received.

The Bureau of the Budget advises as follows:

"You are advised that while there is no objection to the submission of your report, the Bureau of the Budget believes that the Department should have greater freedom in determining the location of facilities than would be provided by this bill. In our judgment, it would be preferable to allow the exercise of scientific judgment in allocating available funds. This would enable these funds to be used for facilities which would contribute to research in disciplines or on problems which have the most urgent need and at institutions with appropriate research potential which now possess few such facilities. Such flexibility, in our opinion, would be preferable to the fixed formula approach in the bill, because there is no evidence of a relationship between farm and rural populations and the desirability or necessity for construction of research facilities."

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
*Secretary.*

○







88TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

Calendar No. 268

# H. R. 40

[Report No. 288]

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 8, 1963

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 20, 1963

Reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, without amendment

---

## AN ACT

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research  
at the State agricultural experiment stations.

1     *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2     *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3     That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to  
4     continue its support of agricultural research at the State  
5     agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds,  
6     on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as  
7     required for the effective conduct of an adequate research  
8     program.

9     SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to assist the State  
10    agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisi-  
11    tion, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other

1 capital facilities (including the acquisition of fixtures and  
2 equipment which are to become a part of such buildings)  
3 which are necessary to more effectively conduct research in  
4 agriculture and sciences related thereto through means of  
5 grants from the Federal Government.

6 SEC. 3. As used in sections 2 to 11, inclusive, of this  
7 Act—

8 (1) the term "State" shall include Puerto Rico;

9 (2) the term "State agricultural experiment sta-  
10 tion" means a department established under the direc-  
11 tion of a college or university in any State in accord-  
12 ance with the Act entitled "An Act donating public  
13 lands to the several States and Territories which may  
14 provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and me-  
15 chanic arts", approved July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301) ;  
16 or a department otherwise established pursuant to  
17 standards prescribed by the State the purpose of which  
18 is to conduct agricultural research; and

19 (3) the term "Secretary" shall mean the Secre-  
20 tary of Agriculture.

21 SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appro-  
22 priated for allocation to the States for the purposes of sec-  
23 tion 2 such sums as the Congress deems advisable.

1       (b) (1) One-third of the funds appropriated pursuant  
2 to this section for any fiscal year shall be allotted equally  
3 among the States.

4       (2) Two-thirds of the funds appropriated pursuant to  
5 this section for any fiscal year shall be allocated among the  
6 States as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the  
7 same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural  
8 population of the State bears to the total rural population of  
9 all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial  
10 census current at the time each such sum is first appropri-  
11 ated; and one-half in an amount which bears the same ratio  
12 to the total amount to be allotted as the farm population of  
13 the State bears to the total farm population of all the States  
14 as determined by the last preceding decennial census current  
15 at the time such sum is first appropriated.

16       (c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secre-  
17 tary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this Act  
18 under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as neces-  
19 sary therefor.

20       SEC. 5. Any State in order to be eligible for payments  
21 from funds allocated pursuant to section 4 shall submit, in  
22 such form as the Secretary may require, specific proposals  
23 for acquisition or construction of physical facilities defined in



1 section 2 of this Act. No State shall receive any payment  
2 for any such proposal unless such proposal is approved by  
3 the Secretary.

4 SEC. 6. (a) No payment shall be made to any State  
5 under the provisions of section 4 of this Act in any amount  
6 greater than the amount made available by such State  
7 from non-Federal funds for purposes for which payments  
8 are made under section 4 of this Act.

9 (b) Any unused portion of the allotment of any State  
10 for any fiscal year shall remain available, at the option of  
11 such State, for payment to such State for a period of not  
12 more than two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which  
13 such allotment is first made available.

14 SEC. 7. With respect to multiple-purpose physical facili-  
15 ties, the segment or portion thereof which is to be utilized for  
16 agricultural research shall be the basis for determination of  
17 fund support under this Act.

18 SEC. 8. For each fiscal year that funds are made avail-  
19 able for allocation to States under the provisions of section 4  
20 and section 6 of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain, at  
21 the earliest practicable date during such year, the amount  
22 of the allocation to which each State is entitled, and shall  
23 notify each State in writing promptly thereafter as to the  
24 amount of such allocation.

25 SEC. 9. (a) Any State agricultural experiment station

1 authorized to receive payments under the provisions of  
2 section 4 of this Act shall have a chief administrative officer,  
3 to be known as a director, and a treasurer or other officer  
4 appointed by the governing board of such station. Such  
5 treasurer or other officer shall receive and account for all  
6 funds paid to such station pursuant to the provisions of this  
7 Act, and shall submit a report, approved by the director of  
8 such station, to the Secretary on or before the first day of  
9 September of each year. Such report shall contain a de-  
10 tailed statement of the amount received under the provisions  
11 of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its dis-  
12 bursements on schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

13 (b) If any portion of the allotted funds received by the  
14 authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experi-  
15 ment station shall by any action or contingency be dimin-  
16 ished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be repaid by the State  
17 concerned, and until repaid no part of any subsequent appro-  
18 priation shall be allocated or paid to such State.

19 SEC. 10. The Secretary shall make an annual report to  
20 the Congress during the first regular session of each year  
21 with respect to (1) payments made under this Act, (2)  
22 the facilities, by States, for which such payments were made,  
23 and (3) whether any portion of the appropriation available  
24 for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the  
25 reasons therefor.

1        SEC. 11. (a) Any agricultural experiment station estab-  
2        lished by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this  
3        Act.

4        (b) With respect to any State in which more than one  
5        agricultural experiment station has been established, any  
6        appropriations allocated for the use of such State pursuant  
7        to the provisions of this Act shall be divided between or  
8        among such institutions as the legislature of such State shall  
9        direct.

10       SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated  
11       such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of  
12       this Act.





---

# AN ACT

---

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

---

MAY 8, 1963

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 20, 1963

Reported without amendment





H. R. 40

(House No. 40)

AN ACT

to provide for the establishment of a

Department of the Interior

and for other purposes

# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued June 26, 1963  
For actions of June 25, 1963  
88th-1st; No. 95

## CONTENTS

Alaska lands.....7	Fair trade.....30	Natural resources.....16
Antidumping.....35	Feed.....4	Peace Corps.....13
Appropriations..1,17,23,46	Foreign trade.....10,49	Peanuts.....5
Area redevelopment....2,34	Forestry.....3,29	Personnel.....27,17
Chicory imports.....10	Gasoline tax.....45	Postal rates.....18
Civil rights.....40	Lands.....7,26,32	Reclamation.....48
Consumers.....33	Lumber imports.....10	Research.....8,15,39,41
Cotton.....21	Marketing.....8,24	Roads.....28
Dairy.....44	Marketing penalties....36	Strip mining.....19
Disaster relief.....4	Metal scrap.....10	Sugar lobbyists.....22
Electrification.....14,15	Minerals.....42	Taxation.....43,45
		Timber.....43
		Time standards.....11
		Tobacco.....6
		Trade expansion.....10
		Transportation.....12,38
		Water pollution.....31
		Water resources.....39
		Wetlands.....32
		Wheat.....20,25,36
		Wool.....47

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Senate debated area redevelopment bill. Both Houses passed measure to continue appropriations to Aug. 31. Senate passed bills to add lands to Cache National Forest, amend penalty law on disaster feed relief, extend law on lease and transfer of tobacco allotments, and authorize Alaska land development. Sen. Burdick commended 50th year of marketing services. Sen. Humphrey urged strong negotiations with Common Market regarding agricultural exports. Sen. Morse commended new USDA national forest access regulations. Rep. Nelsen introduced and discussed bill on animal-drug regulation. Rep. Findley charged pressure on radio and TV stations in wheat referendum. Rep. Hemphill urged changes in two-price cotton system. Rep. Hoeven urged non-payment of lobbying fee under Sugar Act.

## SENATE

1. **APPROPRIATIONS.** Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 508, to continue until passage of the 1964 appropriations or August 31, 1963, whichever occurs first, appropriations for Government agencies (H. Rept. 448, S. Rept. 306). This measure will now be sent to the President. Sen. Hayden explained the coverage of the measure as follows:

"In those instances when bills have passed both bodies and the amounts or authority therein differ, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser of the two amounts approved or under the more restrictive authority.

"When a bill has passed only one House, or when an item is included in only one version of the bill as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate of operations not exceeding the fiscal



1963 rate or the rate permitted by the one House, whichever is lower.

"In instances when neither House has passed appropriation bills for fiscal 1964, amounts are approved for continuing projects or activities conducted in fiscal 1963 not in excess of the current year's rate or at the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower."

2. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Began debate on S. 1163, to increase the authorizations under the Area Redevelopment Act. pp. 10932-4, 10947-85
3. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment S. 1388, to add lands to the Cache National Forest, Utah. pp. 10910-12  
Sen. Morse reviewed and commended the development and provisions of the new USDA regulations on access to national forest lands. pp. 10995-7  
Passed without amendment S. 51, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to relinquish to Wyo. jurisdiction over those lands within the Medicine Bow National Forest known as the Pole Mountain District. p. 10910  
Sen. Neuberger inserted an article, "The Oregon Dunes: The Sands That Time Will Not Save." p. 10919
4. DISASTER RELIEF. Passed without amendment S. 400, to establish penalties for misuse of feed made available for relieving distress or preservation and maintenance of foundation herds. p. 10912
5. PEANUTS. Passed without amendment S. 582, to continue for two additional years the exemption of boiled peanuts from allotments and quotas. pp. 10912, 10915
6. TOBACCO. Passed as reported S. 581, to extend for two additional years the provisions permitting lease of tobacco acreage allotments. pp. 10912-3
7. ALASKA LAND DEVELOPMENT. Passed without amendment S. 623, to provide for a land development program in Alaska. pp. 10913-4
8. RESEARCH. At the request of Sen. Mansfield, passed over H. R. 40, to assist the States to provide additional research facilities at the State agricultural experiment stations. p. 10914
9. MARKETING. Sen. Burdick reviewed and commended the USDA marketing services work on its 50th anniversary. pp. 10919-21
10. FOREIGN TRADE. The Finance Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2827, to extend until June 30, 1966, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and reduction in duty on ground chicory (S. Rept. 308), and H. R. 4174, to continue through June 30, 1964, the suspension of duties on metal scrap (S. Rept. 309). p. 10891  
Sen. Javits inserted letters commenting on his recent speech recommending a reappraisal of the Trade Expansion Act, etc. pp. 10904-7  
Sen. Morse inserted correspondence with Christian Herter on possible control of lumber imports. pp. 10997-8
11. TIME STANDARDS. The Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 1033, "to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes" (S. Rept. 312), and several Senators were added as cosponsors. p. 10892
12. TRANSPORTATION. Passed as reported S. 530, to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year. pp. 10909-10



per centum of the allotment for the farm was actually planted on such farm during each of the two immediately preceding years."; and

(2) Subsection (b) of such section, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(b) Any lease shall be made on an annual basis and on such terms and conditions, except as otherwise provided in this section, as the parties thereto agree."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for two additional years the provisions permitting the lease of tobacco acreage allotments."

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 286), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to authorize, for 2 additional years, the transfer, by lease, of tobacco acreage allotments from one farm to another within the same county. The law does not apply to burley tobacco or cigar filler and cigar binder, types 42, 43, 44, 53, 54, and 55. Under the existing law, an allotment for Maryland (type 32) tobacco could be leased only if at least 75 percent of the allotment for the farm was planted in 1960 and 1961. As introduced, the bill would have permitted leasing of any Maryland tobacco allotment, but on the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture the committee amendment would preclude the leasing of any Maryland tobacco allotment unless at least 75 percent of the allotment for each of the 2 preceding years was planted on the farm.

#### NEED FOR LEGISLATION

In many areas, tobacco acreage allotments have become so small that producers holding such allotments frequently, in any particular year, neglect to plant their allotment because it is an uneconomic operation, or for other reasons.

For the crop years 1964 and 1965 only, this bill would authorize the holders of such small allotments to transfer their allotment to another tobacco producer in the same county if they chose to do so.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amendment to the text of the bill would prohibit the leasing of Maryland tobacco allotments unless at least 75 percent of the allotment was planted on the farm during each of the 2 preceding years. This amendment was developed in order to carry out the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture as outlined in their report which follows.

#### AGRICULTURAL LAND DEVELOPMENT IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 623) to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this

Act may be cited as the "Alaska Farmland Development Act of 1963".

#### DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. In order to provide more adequately for the sound, efficient, and orderly development and utilization of agricultural land resources of the State of Alaska; to facilitate and assure the establishment of family-type farms as economic units of production and to encourage, promote, and strengthen this form of farm enterprise; to provide for Alaska's future economic growth by promoting a sound and stable agriculture, thereby insuring a more adequate and dependable food supply for the present and future population of the State; and in recognition of the strategic position of the State of Alaska in relation to national security and defense, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, and the purpose of this Act shall be, to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska which will assist agricultural producers to develop and utilize more effectively the productive capacity of the State's land resources for agricultural purposes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to formulate and carry out a land development program, which, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will best effectuate the policy and purpose expressed in section 2 of this Act, shall provide for the making of payments or grants to agricultural producers in the State of Alaska for carrying out specified farmland development or treatment measures including, but not limited to, clearing, draining, shaping, and otherwise conditioning land for the production of crops or for pasture.

SEC. 4. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized, within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor, to enter into agreements or other arrangements extending for a period of years with producers determined by him to have control of the farms and ranches covered thereby. The Secretary shall not enter into any such agreement or agreements the effect of which would be to grant to any single producer more than one-fifth of the total amount of funds appropriated for the Alaska land development program for the year in which the agreement is made.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary may utilize the committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitations, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act: *Provided*, That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed \$1,250,000 and for any program year payments shall not exceed \$125,000. The program authorized by this Act shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in the State of Alaska authorized by any other Act.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 287), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill, which is identical to S. 2805 as passed by the Senate on September 28, 1962, provides for payments to assist agricultural producers in Alaska to carry out farmland development measures. Maximum payments

in any year would be \$125,000, and the total cost of the program, exclusive of administrative costs, could not exceed \$1,250,000. Assistance in Alaskan farmland development is needed because of expanding population and the high cost of conditioning land in Alaska. A high percentage of the food consumed in the State is imported.

Attached is the report of the Department of Agriculture favoring enactment of S. 2805. No report has been received as yet from the Department on S. 623, but except for the final sentence of section 4, which was added to S. 2805 after the Department had reported on it, S. 623 is identical to the bill on which the Department reported.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Washington, D.C., May 24, 1962.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of February 7, 1962, for a report on S. 2805, a bill to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska.

This Department recommends that the bill be passed.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for a program of land development which will assist agricultural producers in the State of Alaska to develop and utilize more effectively the productive capacity of the State's land resources for agricultural purposes. The bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and carry out a land development program under which payments or grants would be made to agricultural producers in Alaska for carrying out specified farmland development measures. Such measures may include, but would not be limited to, clearing, draining, shaping, and otherwise conditioning land for the production of crops or for pasture. In making this assistance available, the Secretary would have authority to enter into agreements with agricultural producers extending for a period of years.

Provision is made for utilizing the farmer committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in the administration of the proposed program. The program authorized in this bill would be in addition to other programs in the State of Alaska now provided by law. There is authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitations, a maximum of \$1,250,000 for the entire program, excluding administrative costs, but not to exceed \$125,000 is to be expended in any 1 program year.

We believe the program authorized in this bill is a desirable long-term approach in the needed expansion of agriculture in Alaska. The agricultural economy of the State has not kept pace with its rapid growth in population. Data from the Bureau of the Census show that the population of Alaska increased by 75 percent between 1950 and 1960. While the population as a whole is still predominantly rural (62 percent rural to 38 percent urban), the urban centers increased by 150 percent, as against less than 50 percent in the farming areas.

At present a high proportion of the food consumed in the State of Alaska must be imported. Such importation is costly and acts as a deterrent to orderly economic growth. Lack of local agricultural production could also pose serious problems in maintaining the health and well-being of the people in this strategic area of national security and defense.

The Department recognizes the need for building a stronger agricultural base in Alaska and believes that the proposed legislation would prove a valuable and practical addition to other programs now in operation in the State. There are ample land resources which could be developed into family-type



farms as economic units of production under the assistance authorized in this bill. Such development would prove of value not only to the people of Alaska but would serve the national interest by providing the means by which Alaska's growth would be better assured in an orderly and well-balanced manner for the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

Conditioning land for production in Alaska is expensive because of high labor and equipment costs. The program authorized in this bill would provide for the development of probably 20,000 acres during its authorization with a maximum in any year of 1,500 to 2,000 acres, assuming a cost-sharing arrangement whereby landowners would pay a part of the cost. This amount of land would help to only partially fill the gap between food needs and supply in the State. It would not affect materially the total demand for agricultural products. The demand for fresh produce (vegetables, and dairy and poultry products) is so pressing that expansion in farming would be expected to take place in those directions. The expected expansion would not be great enough to offset the expanded need for these products for the projected increase in population.

It is believed that the enactment of this proposed legislation would result in a total need for \$1,250,000 additional for the entire program, but that an initial appropriation of about \$125,000 would be sufficient for the first year after the bill is enacted. Since the presently established agricultural stabilization and conservation committees may be used to operate the program, the additional administrative costs would be much less than if a new organization were required.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
Secretary.

Mr. BARTLETT subsequently said: Mr. President, Alaska is in the very early stages of economic development. The program contemplated under S. 623 will aid immeasurably the further economic development of this infant State.

The Alaska Farmland Development Act provides for the establishment of program of land development on a continuing and stable basis. Stability is, perhaps, one of the most important economic benefits Alaska will gain from this program.

Agriculture in Alaska has suffered from the vast changes which have taken place in the Nation and in the world in the last 30 years. Farming declined in the 1930's, almost vanished during the 1940's when all of our attention was devoted to the war effort. There was an upsurge of farming shortly after the end of World War II but this declined again during the Korean war. Now farming is struggling to regain its position and take its proper place in Alaska's economy.

Because the development of an agricultural base in Alaska was delayed or postponed due to prior national interests, Alaska farmers now must try to make up their lost ground. They are faced with an entirely different world than existed in the 1930's. They are faced with a world of rapid transportation, high costs, and intense competition.

The Senate, in passing S. 623, recognized the necessity of providing Alaska with at least a minimum of stability in

its agricultural endeavors. The program provides that not more than \$1,250,000 will be spent over a period of not less than 10 years. This is hardly a major effort as compared with the vast expenditures on the national agricultural industry. However, it is sufficient to do that which must be done, sufficient to promote the kind of private development which has always characterized American farming and made American farmers the finest the world has seen.

It should be remembered—it must be remembered—that Alaska farmers share in very few benefits that are granted to others in the agricultural community. Indeed, they are not included at all in most of the Federal programs, and this despite the fact that the man starting out in farming in most cases is most urgently in need of help. S. 623 will help.

The benefits to Alaska's economy and, consequently, to the Nation's economy which will grow from this program will show that the Senate's confidence in Alaska's farmers is well placed.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 40) to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### ACQUISITION OF GREAT FALLS PROPERTY, VIRGINIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1039) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 3, line 14, after the word "are" to strike out "deficient," and insert "deficient: *Provided*, That not more than \$1,000,000 may be appropriated for the acquisition of land under this Act."; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter called the "Secretary") may accept title to, and administer in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, pursuant to the Act of May 29, 1930 (ch. 354. 46 Stat. 482), as amended, the lands, and interests in lands, commonly known as the Great Falls property, more particularly described as follows, to wit:

All of that land in Fairfax County, Virginia, depicted on the drawing designated "NCP 117.1-471B," filed among the land records of National Capital Parks, said drawing being Potomac Electric Power Company's drawing numbered 77345-E of June 20, 1949, as revised by National Capital Parks on October 14, 1960, which land is comprised of 521.292 acres shown on the drawing as area 1, 53.446 acres shown as area 3, and 208.899 acres shown as area 4 on said drawing, the aggregate of which is 783.637 acres.

SEC. 2. In exchange for the conveyance to

the United States of the lands and interests in lands described in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary may convey to the Potomac Electric Power Company all the right, title, and interests of the United States in and to the following described portion of the lands commonly known as the Blue Ponds area:

All that land situated in the county of Prince Georges, State of Maryland, depicted on the drawing designated NCP 123-375, dated October 17, 1960, filed among the land records of National Capital Parks, containing approximately 391 acres, less that land occupied by the reconstructed section of Muirkirk Road under permit of the Department of the Interior, dated September 3, 1954, issued to Prince Georges County, Maryland.

SEC. 3. The Secretary may convey to the county of Prince Georges, State of Maryland, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described portion of the lands commonly known as the Blue Ponds area.

All that land occupied by the reconstructed section of the Muirkirk Road under permit of the Department of the Interior, dated September 3, 1954, issued to Prince Georges County, Maryland.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall consummate the exchange authorized by this Act on the basis of the fair market value of the properties. If the value of Federal properties does not approximately equal the value of privately owned properties, the Secretary may make up the difference by payment from donated funds or appropriated funds if donated funds are deficient: *Provided*, That not more than \$1,000,000 may be appropriated for the acquisition of land under this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 289), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The Government acquired 391 acres of detached land at Blue Ponds, Md., in connection with the construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway which is now surplus to its needs. A 250-foot right-of-way across this property is presently leased and being used by the Potomac Electric Power Co.

The power company owns a tract of 783 acres adjoining the small Virginia State park at the Great Falls of the Potomac River a few miles outside the District of Columbia on the route of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The tract contains remains of the Potomac Canal, built by Gen. George Washington and his associates to provide a skirting channel around the falls for boat traffic up the Potomac River to the west.

Remains include the turning basin and remains of the town of Matildaville, which was based on the canal operation.

The canal is an outstanding remaining example of colonial engineering, and historical evidence of the efforts of General Washington and his associates to establish routes for commerce and communication that would open up the interior areas of the United States to development.

The Great Falls tract has geologic, botanic, wildlife, scenic, and recreational values which add to its worthiness for development and would provide the National Capital area and its many visitors an unduplicated attraction in conjunction with the George Washington Memorial Parkway.







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued July 11, 1963  
For actions of July 10, 1963  
86th - 1st; No. 104

## CONTENTS

Agricultural Attaches...18	Data processing.....19	Foreign currencies.....20
Appropriations.....13,30	Electrification...10,16,28	Forest Service.....13
Area redevelopment.3,14,21	Experiment stations.....1	Forestry.....2
Budget.....20	Export-Import Bank.....8	Lands.....17
Buildings.....18	Farm labor.....22	Manpower.....33
Common market.....34	Farm program.....12	Marketing.....5
Consumers.....5	Federal aid.....6	Monopolies.....7
Counterpart funds.....32	Foreign aid.....9,35	National Service Corps...4
		Public works.....29
		REA loans.....28
		Reclamation.....26
		Research.....1,15,36
		School lunch.....6
		Textiles.....31
		Tobacco.....11,25
		Unemployment.....23
		Water.....24
		Wheat.....27

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed experiment station research facilities bill. Sen. Neuberger criticized rate of mining claims filed in Wilderness areas. Rep. Laird criticized Secretary Freeman's trip to Communist nations. Sen. Dominick introduced and discussed bill to increase interest rates on REA loans. Sen. McNamara introduced and discussed bill to expand public works acceleration program.

## SENATE

1. RESEARCH. Passed without amendment H. R. 40, to authorize the appropriation of Federal funds, on a matching basis, specifically for the purpose of assisting in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other physical facilities for agricultural research in State agricultural experiment stations. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 11734
2. FORESTRY. Sen. Neuberger criticized the rate of mining claims filed in wilderness areas under the Forest Service, stated that she was "disturbed and dismayed by continued erosion of our wilderness heritage and the threats against its existence," and inserted a report from the Forest Service on the estimated number of mining claims filed on national forest lands in wilderness, wild, and primitive areas since Sept. 6, 1961. p. 11680

3. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Sen. Edmondson commended the area redevelopment program and stated that ARA projects have received bipartisan support in Oklahoma and are beginning to bring hundreds of new jobs to the State. p. 11684
4. NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS. Sen. Williams (N. J.) commended the proposed National Service Corps as a means of helping local communities and inserted several items supporting establishment of the Corps. pp. 11691-3
5. CONSUMERS; MARKETING. Sens. Neuberger and Hart inserted articles supporting legislation to regulate packaging and labeling of products in domestic commerce. pp. 11681-2, 11801-2
6. FEDERAL AID. Sen. Javits inserted a table on Federal aid payments to the various States. p. 11673  
Sen. Javits inserted an article reviewing Federal aid to programs in which segregation exists, including a reference to the school lunch program. pp. 11685-7
7. MONOPOLIES. Sen. Javits supported legislation to establish a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws and inserted several items on the subject. pp. 11687-91
8. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 3872, to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank. House conferees have already been appointed. pp. 11720-1
9. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Morse criticized the executive branch for not following the Mutual Security Act and presenting "concrete plans for reducing and terminating bilateral grants of economic aid in the defense support and special assistance categories." pp. 11733-4
10. ELECTRIFICATION. Passed without amendment S. 851, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to market electric power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande. p. 11734
11. TOBACCO. Sen. Neuberger criticized the advertising practices of the cigarette industry. p. 11735

#### HOUSE

12. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Laird criticized Secretary Freeman's coming trip to certain Communist nations while Congress is still in session, and urged the development of "effective dairy program." p. 11662
13. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 5279, the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill, 1964 (includes Forest Service). Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 11664
14. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Cleveland inserted ex-Sen. Cotton's report urging an end to the Area Redevelopment Administration. pp. 11665-6  
Rep. Haley complimented two Fla. cities on rejecting Federal aid from the area redevelopment program. p. 11665



public of France also need a much more affirmative and positive tone than they have had to date. It is the only way I can see in which we can improve the situation and come to a better understanding between our two great countries.

#### FOREIGN AID—INADEQUATE EXECUTION OF MANSFIELD AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the third subject I wish to discuss this afternoon, during my daily comment on my opposition to the foreign-aid bill in its present form—although I hope it will be possible to vote for a suitable foreign-aid bill when the measure comes to the floor of the Senate—is the inadequate execution of the Mansfield amendment. It is only out of my desire to continue to make a record of suggestions for improving the bill that I make these daily speeches.

It should be evident from my remarks about the foreign-aid bill over the past weeks that I no longer have any belief in the tinkering, trimming approach to the fat boy. Clearly, the time has passed for the plastic surgery which used to help blur the unlovely contours of the awkward creature. Surgery of a more drastic nature is obviously required.

Today I want to give another concrete reason for my loss of faith in the ability of the executive branch to recast its anachronistic foreign-aid structure.

Senators know that we who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee have made many attempts to compel the executive branch to recast the foreign-aid program into a manageable one, with specific goals and objectives. We have tried to promote an examination of basic philosophical premises about foreign aid, and indeed, to find out whether such fundamental tenets actually exist. Prominent among such efforts has been the Mansfield amendment.

The distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], our majority leader, in 1959 took the fine initiative of securing the acceptance of section 503(c) in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. This section directed the executive branch to present concrete plans for reducing and terminating bilateral grants of economic aid in the defense support and special assistance categories.

For those who have lost their way in our decade-long game of semantics, I should note that these categories have since joined together under the title of supporting assistance; when the latter is combined with military aid the two are entitled strategic assistance. Perhaps I should also say that a ginkgo blossom "by any other name would smell as sweet."

Now just where do we stand 4 years after the notable initiative of our respected majority leader? I fear the answer is: In pretty much the same old place.

#### CHANGES SINCE 1960

Both reports delivered in response to section 503(c) are depressing reading, and I shall spare Senators the pain and

boredom of having to hear lengthy quotations from the unclassified version. Suffice it to say that much of the latter is devoted to a pedestrian defense of grant aid—although the Mansfield amendment contemplated no such evasion in directing that a specific plan be made for ending that aid in recipient countries.

Thus we read, for example, that:

Against this background, the overall purposes of the defense support and special assistance programs are sound. . . . To reduce or end the requirements for grant aid by altering or abandoning the goals of such aid is a conceivable but not an acceptable approach.

In other words, it is all right for Congress to have conceptions, but the executive branch in its majesty and wisdom does not have to pay any attention to them.

The mistake we made in the Mansfield amendment was putting in the words, "insofar as practicable," when we asked that specific plans be worked out for ending supporting grants.

In a blaze of honesty, the unclassified report of 1960 revealed that the Agency for International Development had no real intention of eliminating the defense support aid to the five countries which received about 75 percent of that aid in 1960. It comes as something of a shock, therefore, to discover that two of the five are not receiving supporting assistance today. But I beg Senators to withhold their tears for the plight of those two countries—there are many other categories of assistance, and our two friends together are scheduled to receive a total approaching half a billion dollars in the coming fiscal year, not including the Public Law 480 program.

I wish I could name the two countries. But the aid they are currently receiving is designated "top secret." It is classified material. However, in this classified material we have the story of the subterfuge in the foreign aid bill. The fact remains that those two countries will continue to get about half a billion dollars in the coming year, not including Public Law 480 funds. Thus we see that the Mansfield amendment was ineffective in reducing aid to these two countries.

After virtually excluding 75 percent of the economic grant program from serious consideration, the executive branch report of 1960 grudgingly saw a possibility of ending grant aid over a 5-year period in 10 countries receiving something over half the remaining 25 percent. Here there has been some progress: nine were on the list for this aid in fiscal 1962; this year only four are getting these grants. I think there is some reason gratefully to ascribe this progress to the change of administrations downtown.

Next, we turn to the list of eight countries which the executive branch considered as being subject to reductions. And we find that five of the eight are still firmly entrenched in the supporting assistance category. In short, we were not promised much in 1960, and we have not gotten much reduction today.

As for the remaining small grant programs, the executive branch scarcely bothered to think about specific reductions. Despite its unwillingness to con-

template change, changes did occur, and six of nine listed areas are not now on the supporting assistance list. On the other hand, new candidates have appeared to vitiate the meaning of this development. Indeed, the executive branch unclassified report forecast this in noting:

Moreover, new needs for grant aid are likely to arise. The grant method of economic assistance . . . has been an essential instrument of foreign policy and, in an uncertain world, promises to remain so.

We were thus told that foreign aid administrators expect to give grant aid as long as the world situation remains uncertain. Under such circumstances, the American taxpayer might start looking to the Almighty for relief, since he would be unlikely to get it on this earth.

I do not want to minimize the importance of the Mansfield amendment. Without it, I daresay we would have made no progress at all. And we have made some, but small, progress.

On the face of it, we seem to have reduced the total of that assistance quite substantially. In fiscal year 1960 the actual appropriation for defense support and special assistance totaled \$940 million. In contrast, the appropriation for supporting assistance in fiscal year 1963 mounted to only \$395 million. That looks like real, if slow, progress.

#### CONGRESS MUST GO FURTHER

But stop a moment and consider the end result. By the time the executive branch completed its normal mystifications—including recoveries, carryovers, transfers, and uses of contingency funds—the total for supporting assistance in the fiscal year 1963 had risen to roughly \$550 million. Moreover, the request for this supporting assistance category for the forthcoming fiscal year has gone up to \$435 million. The bookkeepers give and they take away in a dazzling display of paperwork.

But when the foreign aid bill is analyzed, the incontrovertible fact remains that the administration is not carrying out the spirit and the intent of the Mansfield amendment. I answer again today the question that is often put to me: "Senator, where would you cut?" I would cut here. In my judgment, this proposal for the assistance program should be cut drastically in the bill.

The central question is, Where are we heading? My answer is that we do not really know. To the degree that supporting assistance has declined in amounts, we have turned to the categories of development grants and loans to fill up the kitty. The latter category appears to fulfill the desire of the Congress and the American people for a program of recoverable loans. Yet all indications are that the loans in time will turn out to be grants.

Meanwhile, the token interest charges—three quarters of 1 percent that Congress charged on many loans of ten years, during which the recipient country has not paid a single red cent—almost uniformly less than the cost of the money to us—do little to satisfy my concern over the direction the program is taking.



Mr. President, I frankly doubt that the present means of distinguishing categories in the foreign aid bill amount to very much at all. The bill reminds me of a half-inflated balloon: we squeeze one spot, and another bulge appears. I am inclined to believe the time has come to apply the needle to the balloon, to collapse it, and to build a better structure with better materials.

Our experience with foreign aid makes it overwhelmingly clear that the executive branch bureaucrats will always perform marvels in evading the intent of Congress so long as they are given any latitude whatsoever to do so. Four years have passed since the Mansfield amendment, and we still find ourselves being asked to authorize close to a half a billion dollars of a kind of aid we had every right to believe would have disappeared entirely by now. I submit that the time seems to have come for the Congress to flex its flabby muscles and create the kind of program it believes the President should carry out.

Mr. President, on Friday, I shall discuss what I believe we should do after the collapse of the balloon. I think we should start all over in the foreign aid program, and should grant foreign aid only on the basis of merit and only on the basis of a procedure which will protect the American taxpayers, for under this bill they are being taken for a ride, and the time has come to stop the runaway.

#### TRANSMISSION AND DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 238, Senate bill 851.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 851) to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 1 of the Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255), be amended as follows:

(a) In the first sentence of section 1 change the phrase "Falcon Dam, an international storage reservoir project" to read "Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam, international storage reservoir projects", and change the word "project", the second place it appears, to read "projects".

(b) In the second sentence of section 1 change the word "project" to read "projects".

(c) In the fourth sentence of section 1 of said Act, strike the balance of the sentence beginning with the phrase "in order to make the power and energy generated at said project" and substitute: "for the integration of the Falcon and Amistad projects and in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale

quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, co-operatives, and privately owned companies."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 257), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the power to be generated at the Amistad Dam as he now does with Falcon Dam power. It further authorizes the construction of the necessary transmission lines to integrate the transmission of the two projects for a more effective operation.

The bill was submitted and recommended by the Secretary of the Interior.

The Amistad Dam was authorized for construction and operation by the International Boundary and Water Commission on July 7, 1960. The construction schedule calls for completion of the dam and the first two units of the powerplant early in 1968. These two units will have a generating capacity of 32,000 kilowatts. When all five units are completed the ultimate generating capacity will be 80,000 kilowatts.

In the interest of efficient operation and disposition of the generation of these two projects and in order to give the Bureau of Reclamation ample time to contract for the disposition of the power, the committee recommends the enactment of S. 851.

#### ADDITIONAL FACILITIES FOR RESEARCH AT STATE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 268, House bill 40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 40) to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 288), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill provides for the appropriation of funds to be apportioned among the States for the construction of research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations. Use of Hatch Act funds for such construction is now authorized by section 4 of that act; but only very limited use of such authority has been made, partly because such funds are available only on an annual basis and States have been unable to accumulate sufficient funds for major capital outlays. Grants under the bill would be available for 3 years.

Grant funds would be apportioned under the act to States—

- (1) One-third equally among the States;
- (2) One-third on the basis of rural population; and
- (3) One-third on the basis of farm population.

All Federal grants would have to be matched by at least equal sums from non-Federal sources.

#### HEARINGS

In 1962 hearings were held on H.R. 12712, which is identical to H.R. 40, by the subcommittee in charge of this legislation. Favorable testimony was presented on behalf of the Department of Agriculture and the experiment station section of the legislative committee of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. There was no opposition to the bill.

#### CONSIDERATION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Attached are excerpts from the report of the House Committee on Agriculture (H. Rept. 271, 88th Cong.) further discussing the need for this legislation.

#### NEED

A very substantial part of the tremendous progress which has, in the past few decades, made American agriculture the most efficient in the world, is due to the research work which has been carried out jointly by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the various States in the State agricultural experiment stations. Since 1887, when the Hatch Act was enacted, this work has been carried out cooperatively between the States and the Federal Government, with State funds at least matching the funds made available by the Federal Government. A very large part of the Department's agricultural research is conducted in these State experiment stations.

Since this cooperative research program has been in operation for more than 70 years, and most of the experiment stations were established early in the program, many of the buildings, laboratories, and other facilities are far from modern. Many of them, constructed primarily for research in agricultural production, are not suitable for research in the utilization of agricultural commodities, for the basic research increasingly necessary to develop new uses, nor for employment of the advanced techniques, equipment, and methods which have become available in recent years.

In 1955, Congress recognized the urgent need to improve and modernize the physical facilities of the State experiment stations and amended the Hatch Act (7 U.S.C. 361d) to authorize the use of funds appropriated thereunder "for the purchase and rental of land and the construction, acquisition, alteration, or repair of buildings necessary for conducting research."

For several reasons this authority has not been used. Traditionally, Hatch Act funds have been used almost exclusively for research operations and not for facilities. There is no requirement in the existing law of approval of facility construction in advance by the Secretary in order to avoid duplication or unnecessary expenditures. There is no authority in the existing law for funds allotted to a State to be carried over from one fiscal year to another, making construction of a major facility with matching funds virtually impossible. For these reasons, among others, the Department of Agriculture has not requested nor has the Congress appropriated any funds specifically for the purpose of research facility construction and improvement, although Congress has clearly recognized the need for such a program.

This bill will provide the specific authorization and guidelines for cooperative Federal-State action in bringing about much needed modernization and improvement of the physical facilities for research at the State experiment stations.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the









Public Law 88-74  
88th Congress, H. R. 40  
July 22, 1963

## An Act

To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to continue its support of agricultural research at the State agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds, on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as required for the effective conduct of an adequate research program. Agricultural experiment stations. Research facilities.

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to assist the State agricultural experiment stations in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other capital facilities (including the acquisition of fixtures and equipment which are to become a part of such buildings) which are necessary to more effectively conduct research in agriculture and sciences related thereto through means of grants from the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. As used in sections 2 to 11, inclusive, of this Act—

(1) the term "State" shall include Puerto Rico;

Definitions.

(2) the term "State agricultural experiment station" means a department established under the direction of a college or university in any State in accordance with the Act entitled "An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and mechanic arts", approved July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301); or a department otherwise established pursuant to standards prescribed by the State the purpose of which is to conduct agricultural research; and 12 Stat. 503.  
77 STAT. 90.  
77 STAT. 91.

(3) the term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for allocation to the States for the purposes of section 2 such sums as the Congress deems advisable. Allocation of funds.

(b) (1) One-third of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be allotted equally among the States.

(2) Two-thirds of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be allocated among the States as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural population of the State bears to the total rural population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time each such sum is first appropriated; and one-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the farm population of the State bears to the total farm population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time such sum is first appropriated.

(c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secretary to administer the provisions of section 4 of this Act under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as necessary therefor.

SEC. 5. Any State in order to be eligible for payments from funds allocated pursuant to section 4 shall submit, in such form as the Secretary may require, specific proposals for acquisition or construction of physical facilities defined in section 2 of this Act. No State shall receive any payment for any such proposal unless such proposal is approved by the Secretary. Eligibility.

SEC. 6. (a) No payment shall be made to any State under the provisions of section 4 of this Act in any amount greater than the amount Matching funds.

made available by such State from non-Federal funds for purposes for which payments are made under section 4 of this Act.

(b) Any unused portion of the allotment of any State for any fiscal year shall remain available, at the option of such State, for payment to such State for a period of not more than two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such allotment is first made available.

Multiple-purpose facilities. SEC. 7. With respect to multiple-purpose physical facilities, the segment or portion thereof which is to be utilized for agricultural research shall be the basis for determination of fund support under this Act.

Notification to States. SEC. 8. For each fiscal year that funds are made available for allocation to States under the provisions of section 4 and section 6 of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain, at the earliest practicable date during such year, the amount of the allocation to which each State is entitled, and shall notify each State in writing promptly thereafter as to the amount of such allocation.

Administrative officer, duties. SEC. 9. (a) Any State agricultural experiment station authorized to receive payments under the provisions of section 4 of this Act shall have a chief administrative officer, to be known as a director, and a treasurer or other officer appointed by the governing board of such station. Such treasurer or other officer shall receive and account for all funds paid to such station pursuant to the provisions of this Act, and shall submit a report, approved by the director of such station, to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year. Such report shall contain a detailed statement of the amount received under the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursements on schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

Report to Secretary.

(b) If any portion of the allotted funds received by the authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experiment station shall by any action or contingency be diminished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be repaid by the State concerned, and until repaid no part of any subsequent appropriation shall be allocated or paid to such State.

77 STAT. 91.  
77 STAT. 92.

Report to Congress.

SEC. 10. The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress during the first regular session of each year with respect to (1) payments made under this Act, (2) the facilities, by States, for which such payments were made, and (3) whether any portion of the appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor.

SEC. 11. (a) Any agricultural experiment station established by State law shall be eligible for benefits under this Act.

(b) With respect to any State in which more than one agricultural experiment station has been established, any appropriations allocated for the use of such State pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be divided between or among such institutions as the legislature of such State shall direct.

Appropriation authorization.

SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for proper administration of this Act.

**Approved July 22, 1963.**

#### LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 271 (Agriculture Comm.).  
SENATE REPORT No. 288 (Agriculture & Forestry Comm.).  
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 109 (1963):  
May 6: Considered and passed House.  
July 10: Considered and passed Senate.





